The Dissertation Committee for Christopher Lovell Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

The Overburdened Earth: Landscape and Geography in Homeric Epic

Committee:

Andrew Riggsby, Supervisor

Deborah Beck

Erwin Cook

Larry Kim

Alex Purves

The Overburdened Earth: Landscape and Geography in Homeric Epic

by

Christopher Lovell, B.A.; M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

August 2011

to Amanda, Ben, and Nick

The Overburdened Earth: Landscape and Geography in Homeric Epic

Publication No._____

Christopher Patrick Lovell, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2011

Supervisor: Andrew Riggsby

This dissertation argues that Homer's *Iliad* depicts the Trojan landscape as participant in or even victim of the Trojan War. This representation alludes to extra-Homeric accounts of the origins of the Trojan War in which Zeus plans the war to relieve the earth of the burden of human overpopulation. In these myths, overpopulation is the result of struggle among the gods for divine kingship. Through this allusion, the *Iliad* places itself within a framework of theogonic myth, depicting the Trojan War as an essential step in separating the world of gods and the world of men, and making Zeus' position as the father of gods and men stable and secure.

The Introduction covers the mythological background to which the *Iliad* alludes through an examination of extra-Homeric accounts of the Trojan War's origins. Chapter One analyzes a pair of similes at *Iliad* 2.780-85 that compare the Akhaian army to Typhoeus, suggesting that the Trojan War is a conflict similar to Typhoeus' attempt to usurp Zeus' position as king of gods and men. Chapter Two demonstrates how Trojan characters are closely linked with the landscape in the poem's first extended battle scene (4.422-6.35); the deaths of these men are a symbolic killing of the land they defend. Chapter Three discusses the *aristeia* of Diomedes in Book 5, where his confrontations with Aphrodite, Ares, and Apollo illustrate the heroic tendency to

disrespect the status difference between gods and men. Athena's authorization of Diomedes' actions reveals the existence of strife among the Olympian gods, which threatens to destabilize the divine hierarchy. Chapter Four examines the Akhaian wall whose eventual destruction is recounted at the beginning of Book 12. The wall symbolizes human impiety and its destruction is a figurative fulfillment of Zeus' plan to relieve the earth of the burden of unruly humanity. Finally, Chapter Five treats the *flußkampf* and Theomachy of Books 20 and 21, episodes adapting scenes of divine combat typically associated with the struggle for divine kingship. In the *Iliad*, these scenes show that Zeus' power is unassailable.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Interest in Homeric geography has often focused on the question of accuracy: do the epics faithfully describe real places? Robert Wood, in his *Essay on the Original Genius and Writings of Homer*, a pioneering work of Homeric scholarship published posthumously in 1775, referred to his investigation of the geography of the Troad as fulfillment of "the humble duty of bearing testimony, as an eyewitness, of the Poet's veracity."[1] More than three decades later, Byron recorded his indignant reaction to Thomas Campbell's suggestion that no one cared about the "authenticity of the tale of Troy":[2]

> I have stood upon that plain *daily*, for more than a month, in 1810; and, if any thing diminished my pleasure, it was that the blackguard Byrant had impugned its veracity...I still venerated the grand original as the truth of *history* (in the material *facts*) and of *place*. Otherwise, it would have given me no delight.[3]

For Byron, truth is a necessary condition for Homer's poetry to create delight. One component of this truthfulness is the truth of place, which Byron considered himself able to judge because of his exploration of the Troad. Byron links topographical accuracy with historical accuracy. This link makes a reappearance in Walter Leaf's *Troy*, published in 1912, after the excavations of Schliemann and Dörpfeld had established Hissarlik as the site of Homeric Troy. Leaf believed that the *Iliad* displayed such a great familiarity with Troy and its surroundings, that "no case of such a local inconsistency, not a single anatopism...can be brought home to the *Iliad*."[4] For Leaf,

---

1. Wood (1775) 302.
2. Campbell (1819) 5:311.
3. Byron (1978) 21-22.
4. Leaf (1912) 12.

the accuracy of Homer's description not only demonstrated his eyewitness knowledge of the Troad, but also showed that the *Iliad* was "based on a very solid foundation of historical fact."[5] More recently, John V. Luce has characterized his investigation of Homeric landscapes as a defense of the poems' topographical accuracy against a recent tendency to see Homeric landscapes as poetic constructions.[6]

But an approach that concentrates on Homer's fidelity to the real world risks losing sight of the role of landscape within the poems themselves. For example, one of the more prominent landmarks on the Trojan plain as it appears in the *Iliad* is the tomb (*sēma*) of Ilos, the eponymous founder of the city of Ilion and the grandfather of Priam. The *Iliad* places this tomb between the city and the fords of the river Skamandros, but there is no tumulus visible today in the area, and the tomb remains unidentified.[7] Regardless of its historical reality, within the poem, Ilos' tomb marks the Trojans' ancestral claim to the land, and in this respect it is historically accurate in reflecting the role of tomb of a founding hero in defining the territory of the developing *polis* and protecting it from hostile forces.[8] The tomb is first mentioned during the interrogation of Dolon, a captured Trojan spy, by Odysseus and Diomedes, in Book 10.[9] When asked about the location of Hektor and whether the Trojans intend to withdraw to the city, Dolon replies that Hektor is holding a council at the tomb of Ilos (10.414-16). The Trojans'

---

5. Leaf (1912) 13.
6. Luce (1998) ix, 1-10.
7. See Luce (1998) 133-34.
8. See de Polignac (1995) 143-44. Clay (2007: 248) mentions the tomb of Ilos as one of several landmarks that symbolize the Trojans' possession of the land.
9. See Danek (1988) for the view that Book 10 is an interpolation added to the *Iliad* shortly after its composition.

normal practice has been to withdraw to the city at night, but their newfound success has led them to camp upon the plain. The tomb's next appearance marks another change in the Trojans' fortunes. After the Trojans are put to flight by Agamemnon during his *aristeia*, they pass by a series of landmarks on their way back to the city: first the tomb of Ilos, then a wild fig tree, and last the Skaian Gates and an oak tree growing close by (11.166-70).[10] But the Trojans once again carry the battle to the middle of the plain, and Paris, leaning against Ilos' grave stele, fires an arrow and wounds Diomedes (11.369-78). In each of these appearances, Ilos' monument provides a physical marker of the changing fortunes of war. The tomb appears for the last time in Priam's journey to Akhilleus' tent. Priam passes the tomb of Ilos, and comes to the ford of Skamandros, where he pauses to let his chariot horses drink (24.349-51). At this point, Hermes arrives to provide an escort for the remainder of the journey. Priam is safe in the neighborhood of his grandfather's grave, but no farther.[11] Ilos' tomb is a sign, a *sēma*, of the Trojans' connection to the Troad, which extends back to the city's founding.

This dissertation is concerned with the way the depiction of the Trojan landscape connects the *Iliad* with the mythological past. I argue that the *Iliad*'s representation of the Trojan landscape and of the Akhaians' interactions with it allude to extra-Homeric traditions of the Trojan War, to cosmogonic myth, and to myths of divine succession. Through a dense and interconnected network of allusion, the *Iliad* defines its place within the larger universe of Greek myth, that is, its relation to other narratives about the Trojan War, the myths of heroes, and the

10. On these landmarks, see Thornton (1984) , Hainsworth (1993) on *Iliad* 11.166, and Clay (2007) 248.
11. Thornton (1984) 154-55.

origin of the gods and the cosmos. One strand in this network of allusion is the evocation, through the depiction of the landscape, of extra-Homeric traditions in which Zeus plans the Trojan War to relieve the earth of the burden of human overpopulation. In these traditions, overpopulation is the result of the struggle for primacy among the gods. Overpopulation is thus part of a larger picture of the evolution of the cosmos, and in fact can be seen as an outcome of the procreative energies that drive the growth and development of the early universe. The motif of the overburdened earth is thus intertwined with cosmogonic myth and myths of divine succession, and the Iliadic portrayal of the Trojan landscape alludes to these types of myth both indirectly through its evocation of alternative traditions of the Trojan War and directly, for example through enacting a battle of the gods. The *Iliad* thereby places itself within a framework of cosmogonic myth, depicting the Trojan War as an essential step in separating the world of gods and the world of men, and making Zeus' position as the father of gods and men stable and secure.

It should be clear that my use of the term landscape refers not only to the natural environment of a particular area, but also to the built environment—the structures placed on the land by human beings, such as Ilos' tomb. Landscape, then, refers to the environment in its natural state and as it has been shaped by human activity.[12] To be true to ancient Greek ways of thinking about the world, I should add that landscape is shaped by divine activity as well, though not without noting that aspects of the landscape, such as rivers, are themselves divinities. A

12. This conception of landscape is sometimes referred to as "cultural landscape"; see Ratzel (1895-96), Sauer (1925), Jackson (1989) 13-14, Jones (2003) 21-52.

further clarification of the sense in which I use the word "landscape" is necessary, for it can be used in two senses: it can refer either an actual place or to a representation of a place, particularly in visual art, whether that place is real or imaginary.[13] The Trojan landscape as seen in the *Iliad* is necessarily landscape in the sense of representation. Its status as representation has no implications for the accuracy of the *Iliad*'s description of the Troad. The epic would have needed to conform to a basic set of geographic facts that its archaic audience took as givens about Troy, but these might have been fairly vague pieces of topographic knowledge—for instance, Troy is on the Hellespont, near a mountain named Ida, and its major river is Skamandros. It is not my intention, however, to investigate the relationship between the *Iliad*'s Trojan landscape and the historical Trojan landscape in any detail.

Instead, I will focus on the Trojan landscape as a site of allusion to epic tradition. In particular, I will focus on how the *Iliad*'s description of the Trojan landscape, and Akhaian interactions with it, allude to extra-Homeric traditions that trace the origins of the war to the overpopulation of the earth and to closely related traditions such as myths of divine succession and of divine combat. Before I explain how the *Iliad* incorporates these traditions, it will be helpful to set out some examples. In this introduction, I will discuss some examples of the overpopulation motif, and show how overpopulation and its solution is a sequel to the struggle over divine succession. The examples of the overpopulation motif that I am about to consider come exclusively from Greek sources, but Near Eastern and other mythologies supply an abundance of examples of a divine plan to relieve the earth of an excessive and overweening

13. On this double sense of landscape, see Hirsch (1995) 7-10 and Jackson (1997) 299-306.

population. It is likely that the motif originated in the Near East and was transmitted from there to Greece.[14] I will discuss these parallels in the body of the dissertation when they can illuminate individual points of my argument.

The overpopulation motif is perhaps best known from a fragment of the proem of the Cyclic epic *Kypria*, preserved in a scholion to the *Iliad*:[15]

> ἦν ὅτε μυρία φῦλα κατὰ χθόνα πλαζόμεν᾽ αἰεὶ
> < > βαρυστέρνου πλάτος αἴης,
> Ζεὺς δὲ ἰδὼν ἐλέησε καὶ ἐν πυκιναῖς πραπίδεσσι
> κουφίσαι ἀνθρώπων παμβώτορα σύνθετο γαῖαν,
> ῥιπίσσας πολέμου μεγάλην ἔριν Ἰλιακοῖο,
> ὄφρα κενώσειεν θανάτωι βάρος. οἱ δ᾽ ἐνὶ Τροίηι
> ἥρωες κτείνοντο, Διὸς δ᾽ ἐτελείετο βουλή.
>
> there was a time when myriad tribes, always wandering over the land
> ...the breadth of deep-breasted earth,
> and Zeus, seeing this, took pity and in his shrewd mind
> contrived to relieve the all-nurturing earth of men,
> and he fanned up the great strife of the war at Ilion,
> so that he might lighten the weight through death. And at Troy
> the heroes were being slain, and the plan of Zeus was being brought to
> fulfilment.

The earth is overburdened by the numbers of humanity; Zeus pities her, and contrives the Trojan War to relieve her of the weight. The same scholion that preserves this fragment of the *Kypria* precedes the quotation with a prose version of the war's beginnings:[16]

---

14. See Kirk (1970) 116-17, Scodel (1982) 40-41, Hendel (1987) 18-20, Burkert (1992) 100-103, Koenen (1994), Mayer (1996), and West (1997) 480-82. Burkert and West propose that the motif was brought to Greece in the archaic period, with West arguing for a data as late as the second half of the sixth century, but I see no reason to pinpoint a single time of transmission.
15. Scholion AD to *Iliad* 1.5 (*Cypria* fr. 1 Bernabé and Davies). Unless otherwise noted, all translations from the Greek are my own. Marks (2002: 6-7) notes that the fragment lacks the invocation of the Muse that conventionally opens ancient Greek epics, and so these lines cannot be the very beginning of the poem, as is sometimes assumed.
16. Scholion AD to *Iliad* 1.5.

> φασὶ γὰρ τὴν γὴν βαρουμένην ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων πολυπληθείας, μηδεμιᾶς ἀνθρώπων οὔσης εὐσεβείας, αἰτῆσαι τὸν Δία κουφισθῆναι τοῦ ἄχθους. τὸν δὲ Δία, πρῶτον μὲν εὐθὺς ποιῆσαι τὸν Θηβαϊκὸν πόλεμον, δι᾽ οὗ πολλοὺς πάνυ ἀπώλεσεν. ὕστερον δὲ πάλιν συμβούλῳ τῷ Μώμῳ ἐχρήσατο. ἣν Διὸς βουλὴν Ὅμηρός φησιν. ἐπειδὴ οἷός τε ἦν κεραυνοῖς ἢ κατακλυσμοῖς πάντας διαφθεῖραι, τοῦτο τοῦ Μώμου κωλύσαντος, ὑποθεμένου δὲ αὐτῷ γνώμας δύο, τὴν Θέτιδος θνητογαμίαν, καὶ θυγατρὸς καλὴν γένναν.
>
> For they say that the earth, being weighed down by a great number of men, since there was no piety among men, asked Zeus to be relieved of the burden. And Zeus first at once caused the Theban War, through which he utterly destroyed very many men. But then once more [he destroyed many men], consulting with Momos as an advisor; this is the plan that Homer calls the plan of Zeus. Although he could have destroyed everyone with thunderbolts or floods, Momos prevented this, and suggested two ideas to him, the marriage of Thetis to a mortal, and the birth of a beautiful daughter.

This prose account is similar to the *Kypria* fragment in assigning the cause of earth's suffering to overpopulation, but differences are immediately apparent.[17] For one, overpopulation is joined with a lack of piety among men as a cause of earth's discomfort. In addition, Earth makes a direct appeal to Zeus for aid, rather than simply attracting his pity. Further, Zeus' plan embraces the Theban War as well as the Trojan, and Zeus entertains the possibility of destroying humanity by natural disasters before Momos proposes the double strategy of causing war through Akhilleus and Helen.[18] These differences strongly suggest that the prose account is not summarizing the *Kypria*, but another source, or perhaps sources.[19] In other words, the overpopulation motif is not exclusive to the *Kypria*; instead, it is a feature of multiple traditions about the Trojan War.[20] The

17. See Burkert (1992) 102, Marks (2002) 10-11.
18. Mayer (1996: 1-15) sees Akhilleus and Helen as instruments by which Zeus transfers strife from the divine sphere to humans.
19. Kullmann (1955) 180, Burkert (1992) 102, West (1997) 481n125, Marks (2002) 11n29.
20. Marks (2002) 10. The motif is also found in Euripides: *Electra* 1282, *Helen* 36-41, *Orestes* 1836-41.

Iliad, therefore, need not allude exclusively to the *Kypria* tradition, still less to a fixed text of the *Kypria*, but rather to a complex of ideas about the war's origins which could be variously realized in multiple epic and mythological traditions.

The overpopulation motif also appears in a fragment of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*. This fragment, usually thought to belong to the last part of the work, begins by cataloguing the suitors of Helen. It then reports Helen's marriage to Menelaos and the birth of their daughter Hermione, before abruptly switching to describe a divisive conflict among the gods (fr. 204.95-103MW):[21]

πάντες δὲ θεοὶ δίχα θυμὸν ἔθεντο
ἐξ ἔριδος· δὴ γὰρ τότε μήδετο θέσκελα ἔργα
Ζεὺς ὑψιβρεμέτης, †μεῖξαι κατ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν
τυρβάξας,† ἤδη δὲ γένος μερόπων ἀνθρώπων
πολλὸν ἀϊστῶσαι σ̣π̣ε̣ῦ̣δ̣ε̣, π̣ρ̣[ό]φασιν μὲν ὀλέσθαι
ψυχὰς ἡμιθέω[ν ....]ο̣ι̣σ̣ι̣ βροτοῖσι
τέκ̣να θεῶν μι[...].[..]ο̣.[ὀφ]θαλμοῖσιν ὁρῶντα,
ἀλλ̣' ο̣ἳ μ[ὲ]ν μάκ̣[α]ρ̣ες κ̣[.....]ν̣ ὡ̣ς̣ τ̣ὸ̣ πάρος περ
χωρ̣ὶς ἀπ' ἀν[θ]ρ̣ώπω̣ν̣[βίοτον κα]ὶ̣ ἤθε' ἔχωσιν

and all the gods were divided into two factions
from strife: for indeed then high-thundering Zeus was devising
amazing deeds, to stir up troubles on the boundless earth,
and he was eager to destroy the multitudinous race of mortal men,
with the *prophasis* of destroying
the lives of the *hēmitheoi* … to mortals …
children of the gods …
but the blessed ones … as before
might have their livelihood and haunts apart from men

21. On the position of this passage within the *Catalogue of Women*, see West (1985) 119-21; more generally, see West (1961) 132-36, Scodel (1982) 37-38, Burkert (1992) 102, Koenen (1994) 26-34, West (1997) 480-81, Clay (2005) 29-34.

Interpretation of this fragment is made difficult by the state of the text. It is clear, however, that the catastrophe Zeus intends to bring upon mortals is the Trojan War. Zeus is eager to make unseen the *genos* of mortals. Their *genos* is *pollon* (99), which indicates not just that they are numerous, but that their numbers are excessive.[22] The passage does not dwell further on the numbers of humanity, but instead moves to another facet of Zeus' plan, the destruction of the *hēmitheoi*. This term is rare in archaic Greek poetry, and occurs in contexts that emphasize the distance between the heroic past and the present day of the narrator and the audience.[23] In this fragment, the word presents the heroes as figures from a past age, which the catastrophe of the Trojan War brings to a close. At the same time, relations between gods and men are permanently changed. The close contact between mortals and immortals that engendered the heroes ceases, and the gods will now live apart from men (102-103).[24] The solution to overpopulation is thus subsidiary to Zeus' overriding aim in planning the Trojan War: the separation of gods and men.[25]

---

22. On *pollon* (99) as an indication of overpopulation, see West (1997) 481, and Clay (2005) 31.
23. Nagy (1979) 159-60, Scodel (1982) 36, Clay (2005) 30. The word *hēmitheoi* appears only once in the *Iliad* (12.24), in the description of the post-war destruction of the Akhaian wall that begins Book 12. This passage will be discussed in Chapter Four.
24. In seeing these lines as referring to the gods, I follow Clay (2005: 29-32). For a different view, see West (1961: 130-36, 1997: 481) and Koenen (1994: 28-29), who believe that Zeus' *prophasis* to destroy the heroes (lines 99-100) is a pretext, and that his true intention is to relocate the *hēmitheoi* on the Isles of the Blessed. This interpretation receives support from the fact that in Hesiod's *Works and Days* the heroic generation, which is also referred to as *hēmitheoi*, is partially destroyed by the Theban and Trojan Wars, and partially removed to the Isles of the Blessed, where they have "a livelihood and haunts apart from men" (δίχ' ἀνθρώπων βίοτον καὶ ἤθε', *Works and Days* 169). But, as Clay (2005: 30n28) notes, in the *Catalogue* fragment, the "blessed ones" (*makares*, 102) who are to live apart from men are more likely to be the gods than the *hēmitheoi*; an instance of *makares* further on in the passage certainly refers to the gods (117).
25. See also Nagy (1999) 220.

The link between overpopulation and the separation of gods and men in the *Catalogue* fragment demonstrates that the full significance of overpopulation is only apparent when viewed against the backdrop of the history of the evolution of the cosmos. Kenneth Mayer has elucidated how the overpopulation motif fits into cosmic history by demonstrating its links with the succession myth.[26] Mayer shows that in myths from the Near East, Iran, and India, overpopulation is part of a larger mythical pattern in which the creation of humanity is tied to the final struggle for the succession of heavenly power; the losing gods are often involved in the creation of humans, marking mortals out as inherently flawed. The strife among gods that has caused the struggle over divine succession is then displaced into the mortal sphere. After its creation, humanity experiences a Golden Age, which results in overpopulation. Overpopulation is in turn resolved by a disaster that becomes an enduring feature of human life, such as war, famine, or death itself. Overpopulation is ended, in other words, by the imposition of the human condition. With this pattern established, Mayer then argues that the *Kypria* has made both the displacement of divine succession and the flawed creation of humanity into integral components of Zeus' plan to cause the Trojan War, in the form of Akhilleus and Helen respectively. The marriage of Peleus and Thetis, as Laura Slatkin has shown, brings the struggle over divine succession to a close.[27] Thetis was fated to bear a son greater than his father; rather than marry her himself and give rise to a son that would replace him, Zeus ensured that Thetis married a

26. Mayer (1996) 1-15.
27. Slatkin (1991).

mortal. Helen, as Zeus' instrument to bring war and suffering to mankind, corresponds to the flawed creation of humanity.

Jenny Strauss Clay has argued that the overpopulation of the earth brings to a close the cosmogonic process that began with Gaia herself.[28] Clay's argument focuses on the fragment from the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* that relates Zeus' planning of the Trojan War (fr. 204MW). The *Catalogue*, in the form we have it now, was designed as a continuation of the Hesiodic *Theogony*, and so presupposes Gaia as one of the primordial parents of all things. Gaia's reproductive capacity enables the expansion and development of the cosmos, but at the same time the female procreative power that she embodies is a destabilizing force, bringing about new generations to succeed the old. The cycle of succession in heaven ceases when Zeus appropriates the reproductive ability of the female with the absorption of the goddess Mētis. Generational succession is displaced into the mortal sphere and the eventual result is overpopulation. By relieving Gaia of this burden, Zeus brings the cosmogonic process to an end, making the gulf between gods and men permanent.

To recapitulate, several extra-Homeric traditions make the overpopulation of the earth the impetus for Zeus' planning of the Trojan War. Other motives for the war can be joined with overpopulation, such as mortal impiety or Zeus' desire to eliminate the heroes. The destruction of the heroes turns out to be a component of Zeus' project to effect the permanent separation of gods and men. The overpopulation of the earth thus figures in the final stages of the evolution of an ordered universe, but results from earlier stages in that cosmogonic process, so that

28. Clay (2005) 31-32.

overpopulation follows upon the resolution of divine succession, and can ultimately be traced back to the feminine procreative energy that began the development of the cosmos.

The *Iliad* avoids overt mention of overpopulation as a motivation for the Trojan War. Instead, the poem alludes to the earth's suffering under the burden of overpopulation through its depiction of the Trojan landscape and of the Akhaians' interactions with it. Through its program of allusion, the poem places itself in a time when the stabilization of the cosmos is still ongoing, and shows this process unfolding in its own narrative. The poem thus adopts the perspective that the Trojan War is an key step in effecting the separation of men and gods and in securing the stability of the cosmic order.

My argument proceeds by analyzing key passages of the *Iliad*, following their order of appearance in the poem. Chapter One analyzes a pair of similes that characterize the Akhaian army at the close of the Catalogue of Ships (2.780-85) by comparing the groaning of the earth under the feet of the Akhaians with its groaning as Zeus lashes the earth around Typhoeus. I argue that these similes present the story of Typhoeus as a mythological paradigm against which to interpret the actions of the Akhaians and the narrative of the *Iliad* as a whole. The imagery and language of the similes allude to the central episode of Typhoeus' mythology, his combat with Zeus. This allusion brings to the fore Typhoeus' role as the monstrous son of Gaia who attempted to overthrow Zeus and become father of gods and men, and so evokes his role in the larger narrative structure of the succession myth. To illuminate Typhoeus' role in the succession myth generally, I analyze his appearance in Hesiod's *Theogony*, and show that his defeat plays a crucial and hitherto underappreciated role in halting the cycle of generational succession. I

reinforce this analysis by examining Typhoeus' appearances in other Greek sources and by examining parallel figures in several Hittite texts; these comparanda leave little doubt that Typhoeus belongs to a long tradition widely diffused throughout the Aegean and Near East. Having established that in Hesiodic and other Greek literature Typhoeus' attempt on Zeus is an organic element of the succession myth, I turn to the similes' implications for the interpretation of the *Iliad*. The similes imply that the current conflict is an echo of the battle of Zeus and Typhoeus, but they do not themselves specify whether the Akhaians are to be understood as similar to Zeus or to Typhoeus. The ambiguity of the similes encourages two divergent interpretations: one in which the Akhaians punish the faithless Trojans as Zeus punishes Typhoeus, and a second in which the Akhaians, like Typhoeus, are a threat to cosmic order.

Chapter Two treats the representation of the Trojan landscape in the first extended battle narrative in the *Iliad* (4.422-6.35). The chapter proceeds by analyzing the landscape imagery of selected passages from the first pitched battle scene in the *Iliad* in the order they occur in the narrative. My analysis shows how the landscape is drawn into the battle and reveals two ways in which the landscape imagery of this section implicates the action of the poem in a longer history of the cosmos. In the chapter's first half, through an examination of the section's opening similes, I demonstrate how associations made in this section of the *Iliad* between Greeks and the sea and between Trojans and rivers reflect a pattern found throughout the *Iliad* in which the opposing sides are assimilated to salt and fresh water. The conflict between Greeks and Trojans reflects the strife between these two types of water found in theogonic myth that makes Okeanos and Tethys the primeval parents of all things, and parallels the antagonistic relationship in Mesopotamian

myth between Apsu and Tiamat, divinities of fresh and salt water respectively.[29] The assimilation of the opposing sides to opposing waters thus elevates the struggle before the walls of Troy to an elemental conflict which stretches back to the very beginnings of things. In the chapter's second half, I deal with a long list of named but minor Trojan warriors killed by Akhaians, who by their close associations with the Trojan countryside, link the *Iliad* to the prehistory of the Trojan War. Through their deaths, these minor characters figure the Akhaian attack as a devastation of the landscape itself. This figurative combat anticipates the actual combat with the landscape that occurs in Akhilleus' battle with the river Skamandros in Book 21. Finally, as I discuss in the chapter's conclusion, in showing the landscape figuratively suffering at the hands of mortals, the poem recapitulates the cause of the Trojan War found in extra-Homeric accounts such as the *Kypria*: the weighing down of the earth by humanity.

Chapter Three deals with the *aristeia* of Diomedes that occupies Book 5. This chapter departs from my focus on landscape imagery in order to show that Diomedes' *aristeia* dramatizes themes similar to those seen in first the two chapters. First of all, by fighting against and defeating gods, Diomedes displays a general heroic tendency to exceed the boundaries of humanity and thus threatens the distinction between mortals and immortals. Diomedes' feats are authorized and encouraged by the goddess Athene, which demonstrates a second problem with heroic endeavor: the gods' entanglement with mortals perpetuates strife within the divine community. The continued existence of divine strife, exacerbated by the gods' support of heroes, ultimately threatens the stability of the cosmic order.

---

29. Fenno (2005) 22-23.

Chapter Four deals with the fortification wall hastily built by the Akhaians at the end of Book 7 to protect their camp from the Trojans, despite their unexpected success in the absence of Akhilleus. In Books 12-15, the Akhaian wall becomes central to the narrative and the most prominent element of the built environment of the Troad, as the Trojans first break through one of the gates of the wall, are repulsed by an Akhaian counterattack, and then breach the wall yet again. But before this battle, at the beginning of Book 12, Homer narrates the wall's postwar destruction by the united efforts of the gods Apollo, Poseidon, and Zeus. The wall is thus created and destroyed within the poem. As Aristotle observed, the same poet who created the wall made it vanish.[30] I argue that the wall's creation and destruction has thematic significance within the *Iliad*. This wall is built without sacrifices to Poseidon, which arouses his anger at the Akhaians' disrespect. This slight to Poseidon parallels an episode from an earlier part of Troy's history, when Poseidon and Apollo built Troy's walls for Laomedon, Priam's father, who then refused the gods their promised compensation. The Akhaians' failure to sacrifice is thus similar to Laomedon's cheating of Poseidon and Apollo. Both actions are symptomatic of a human tendency to disrespect the gods. In the account of the wall's postwar destruction at the beginning of Book 12, the wall comes to symbolize the entire Trojan War and the death of what the *Iliad* in a memorable phrase calls the "generation of demigod men" (ἡμιθέων γένος ἀνδρῶν, 12.24). This mention of the *hēmitheoi* equates the removal of the wall with the closure of the heroic age, and implies that the Akhaians' failure to sacrifice is emblematic of a wider pattern of disrespect for the gods.

30. Aristotle fr. 162 Rose.

Chapter Five deals with Akhilleus' battle with the river Skamandros and the Theomachy, or battle between the gods. This chapter examines these episodes as adaptations of theogonic myth. In a theogonic context, theomachy has to do with a god either establishing himself as the head of the pantheon, or defending his position against a challenger. Akhilleus' fight with the river is an example of a narrative pattern known as the combat myth, and when this pattern is part of a theogonic narrative it too has to do with who will hold kingship over the gods. But in Book 21 Zeus' power is not at stake. Akhilleus is not presented as in any way seeking to displace Zeus, and the gods who fight in the Theomachy do not vie for cosmic supremacy—indeed, Zeus does not participate in the gods' battle, but enjoys it as a spectator. The *Iliad* has adapted theogonic motifs to emphasize precisely this point, that at this stage in the evolution of the cosmos, no serious challenge to Zeus' authority is possible. Modern critics have tended to see the Theomachy as a whole as providing comic relief before the true climax of Akhilleus' *aristeia*, his duel with Hektor, or as contrasting the carefree life of the gods with the seriousness of mortal experience. But in fact in the Theomachy Zeus himself uses humor, or more specifically ridicule, as a means of exhibiting and thus reinforcing his secure control over the existing social hierarchy among the gods.

A short coda summarizes the findings of the dissertation, namely, that through its portrayal of landscape the *Iliad* advances a program of allusions to extra-Homeric tradition that positions the Trojan War as the final step in a narrative of how the cosmos came to be as it is, a confirmation of the supremacy of the will of Zeus, and the final separation of the divine sphere from the human.

Chapter One: The Typhoeus Similes (*Iliad* 2.780-85)

After the conclusion of the Catalogue of Ships, a pair of similes describes the advance of the Akhaian army (2.780-85):[1]

> οἳ δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἴσαν ὡς εἴ τε πυρὶ χθὼν πᾶσα νέμοιτο·
> γαῖα δ᾽ ὑπεστενάχιζε Διὶ ὣς τερπικεραύνῳ
> χωομένῳ ὅτε τ᾽ ἀμφὶ Τυφωέϊ γαῖαν ἰμάσσῃ
> εἰν Ἀρίμοις, ὅθι φασὶ Τυφωέος ἔμμεναι εὐνάς·
> ὣς ἄρα τῶν ὑπὸ ποσσὶ μέγα στεναχίζετο γαῖα
> ἐρχομένων· μάλα δ᾽ ὦκα διέπρησσον πεδίοιο.
>
> And they went as if the entire earth was being devoured by fire:
> and the earth groaned as though struck by Zeus who delights in thunder,
> angered, when he lashes the earth about Typhoeus
> in the land of the Arimoi, where they say Typhoeus has his resting place.
> So then the earth was groaning greatly under their feet
> as they went, and very swiftly they were crossing over the plain.

The first simile compares the Akhaians' advance to that of a devouring fire. The second likens the groaning of the earth under the Akhaians' feet to its groaning when Zeus lashes the earth about Typhoeus. This is the sole mention in Homer of Typhoeus, the monstrous son of Gaia who attempted to overthrow Zeus. His appearance comes in one of the few Homeric similes with mythological content, and it is the first such simile to occur in the *Iliad*.[2] By alluding to an extra-Homeric narrative, the simile presents the story of Typhoeus as a potential paradigm for the narrative of the *Iliad*.

---

1. Unless otherwise noted, line numbers refer to the *Iliad*.
2. A second mythological simile compares the Trojan army to cranes bringing battle to the Pygmies at the beginning of Book 3 (3.1-8), just after the catalogue of the Trojans and their allies at 2.816-77.

My argument in this chapter falls into four parts. First, I discuss the similes' position in the narrative and the significance of their placement. Second, I show that the imagery and vocabulary of both similes jointly evoke the central episode of Typhoeus' mythology, his combat with Zeus. Following this, I discuss the role Typhoeus plays in the larger framework of the succession myth; since both Typhoeus and the succession myth are adaptations of Near Eastern tradition, I will also examine related material in Near Eastern texts. Finally, I discuss the implications of this passage's allusion to these traditions for the interpretation of the *Iliad*, and how it raises the possibility that the *Iliad* might turn out to be the story of another attempt to overthrow the established order of the cosmos and the rule of Zeus.

Placement and Ring Composition

This passage follows the Catalogue of Ships and closes the exhaustive listing of the individual Akhaian contingents and their commanders with an image of the army as a whole. As Calvert Watkins has noted, the passage is strongly marked by ring composition, which both marks out the similes as a discrete unit of the narrative and makes them the closing members of a frame surrounding the Catalogue.[3] The passage begins and ends with the motion of the Akhaian forces (ἴσαν, 780; ἐρχομένων, 785). This ring structure frames both similes as a unified description of the Akhaian advance. A smaller ring formed by the mirror image of γαῖα δ' ὑπεστενάχιζε (beginning of 781) ... στεναχίζετο γαῖα (end of 784) encloses Zeus' lashing of

3. Watkins (1996) 451-52; see also Niles (1979) 924.

Typhoeus. A larger ring structure is formed by echoes of imagery from the first of a series of seven similes that introduces the Catalogue of Ships (2.455-58):[4]

> ἠΰτε πῦρ ἀΐδηλον ἐπιφλέγει ἄσπετον ὕλην
> οὔρεος ἐν κορυφῇς, ἔκαθεν δέ τε φαίνεται αὐγή,
> ὣς τῶν ἐρχομένων ἀπὸ χαλκοῦ θεσπεσίοιο
> αἴγλη παμφανόωσα δι' αἰθέρος οὐρανὸν ἵκε.
>
> As a consuming fire sets alight a boundless forest
> on the peak of a mountain, and its gleam shines from far off,
> so the dazzling gleam went up to heaven through the air
> from their marvelous bronze as they went.

Both before and after the Catalogue there is a comparison of the movement of the Akhaian forces to fire. But the nature of the fire differs in each case. In the simile before the Catalogue, the fire is conspicuous for its visibility from a distance. This does not mean that its destructive capacity is concealed—the adjective ἀΐδηλον, which is derived from ἀ-ϝιδεῖν, "to make unseen,"[5] may be a pun on the visibility of the fire together with its capacity to consume—but the emphasis lies on the fire's visibility. In contrast, the simile after the Catalogue focuses purely on the fire's destructive force. Instead of burning a "boundless forest," this fire causes the "entire earth" to be devoured (χθὼν πᾶσα νέμοιτο, 2.780). It as if the long cataloguing of the Akhaian forces has magnified the scale and intensity of the fire.

The noise made by the Akhaians' march forth provides another link to the similes preceding the Catalogue. Just after the simile of the forest fire (2.455-58), the Akhaian forces are compared to birds gathering on the meadow of the Kaüstrios; as the meadow "roars" (σμαραγεῖ, 2.463) from the birds' cries, so the earth "resounds" (κονάβιζε, 2.466) under the feet of men and

4. See Kirk (1985) on *Iliad* 2.780, Nimis (1987) 75, Watkins (1996) 451.
5. *LSJ* s.v. ἀΐδηλος.

horses. These sounds are picked up by the earth's groaning under the Akhaians' feet after the Catalogue (γαῖα δ' ὑπεστενάχιζε, 2.781; ὣς ἄρα τῶν ὑπὸ ποσσὶ μέγα στεναχίζετο γαῖα, 784). But this imagery is found even earlier in Book 2. As the Akhaians assemble for Agamemnon's disastrous test of the army, the earth groans underneath them: "The assembly was in uproar, and the earth groaned under the host as it sat, and there was a din..." (τετρήχει δ' ἀγορή, ὑπὸ δὲ **στεναχίζετο** γαῖα/λαῶν ἱζόντων, ὅμαδος δ' ἦν..., 2.95-96).[6] The Typhoeus passage, then, is not only part of a ring structure but part of a pattern of repeated imagery that extends throughout Book 2. As with the fire similes, the imagery becomes more violent after the Catalogue. In the earlier passages (2.95-96, 459-66), the earth groans or resounds because of the movement of men or animals, but there is no hint of intentional violence. After the Catalogue, the earth groans because of deliberate action taken against the earth, as Zeus "lashes" it (γαῖαν ἰμάσσῃ, 2.782).

To sum up, ring composition focuses attention on the passage both as a distinct unit and as the final part of a frame enclosing the Catalogue of Ships. The passage is also the culmination of a series of images of the earth groaning under the weight of the Akhaians that extends through Book 2. These ring structures are not merely formal devices, but offer a frame through which to view and evaluate the Akhaians, one in which Typhoeus plays a defining role.

Imagery and Allusion

The imagery of fire and the groaning of the earth that ties this passage to earlier parts of the *Iliad* also appears in one other passage of archaic Greek poetry dealing with Typhoeus, in

6. See Kirk (1985) on *Iliad* 2.781-84, Nimis (1987) 77.

Hesiod's *Theogony*. The *Theogony* also includes another image from the Iliadic similes, Zeus' lashing of Typhoeus. These three shared elements—fire, the groaning of the earth, and the lashing of Typhoeus—need not indicate that the *Iliad* alludes to the *Theogony* as a fixed text (or vice versa). It is more likely that both poems are drawing upon a common body of traditional material which associated this imagery with Typhoeus. The *Theogony* contains an extensive section about Typhoeus, and so it could be said that the poem has incorporated a traditional narrative into its own. In contrast, the *Iliad* evokes this common tradition by means of two similes in a mere six lines.

The Iliadic passage explicitly signals its reliance upon tradition—Typhoeus' resting place in the land of the Arimoi is not something that the narrator has seen for himself, but knowledge that has been passed on by oral tradition, as indicated by *phasi* ("they say", 2.784).[7] Another indication that Typhoeus' story was well known is his mention in a simile, for similes employ familiar images and information to illuminate the main narrative.[8] This is not to repeat the commonplace that similes draw upon the world of everyday life.[9] If, as is sometimes said, Typhoeus' lashing "explains" earthquakes, this would mean that an event known through direct or secondhand experience was illuminated by an event known through storytelling.[10] Typhoeus

---

7. De Jong (1987) 49, 236; Scodel (2002) 79. The *Theogony* (304-308) also mentions the land of the Arimoi, where "they say" (φασὶ, 306) Echidnē mated with Typhaōn (the form of the monster's name used in this passage) and bore him children.
8. Watkins (1995) 452; Minchin (2001) 31, 42-43.
9. For this view see Redfield (1978) 188-89; Edwards (1991) 35.
10. See West (1966) on *Theogony* 858 for the view that the lashing of Typhoeus explained earthquakes. Watkins (1996:454) notes that West employs a "gratuitous and discredited assumption" that myth explains natural phenomena. Typhoeus is often associated with volcanic regions (on which see Johnston 2005:298)—Pindar says that he lies beneath Aitna and Kymē

would have been known to the archaic audience not as a feature of their everyday, lived experience, but as part of their cultural knowledge, gained from epic performance, other forms of storytelling, and other means of the transmission of myth.[11] For an audience familiar with Typhoeus' mythological career, the single incident named, his repeated punishment in the land of the Arimoi, would have evoked parts of the myth that were left unmentioned. In particular, the imagery of fire and the earth's groaning would have evoked the central episode of the Typhoeus myth—his combat with Zeus.

The type of allusion operative in this passage, where the imagery and diction used by the *Iliad* evoke a specific episode from a traditional narrative, has sometimes thought to be possible only between written texts.[12] For instance, in a 2006 article Jonathan Burgess argued that Homeric poetry cannot reflect traditional myth in great detail; in oral transmission, the only parts of a traditional narrative that will remain stable are the essential elements (by which he means the irreducible actions of the plot), and only these stable elements will be brought into a Homeric context.[13] This would mean that diction and imagery could not direct the Homeric audience to a particular scene within a narrative, for these elements would change from performance to performance. Burgess has since revised his view to allow that "certain

---

(*Pythian* 1.15-20), and Aiskhylos places him beneath Aitna (*Prometheus Bound* 353-79)—but this is not equivalent to saying that Typhoeus explains volcanic activity, or the earthquakes often associated with volcanic activity.

11. Muellner (1990) argues that epic similes are "a transformation of traditional lore...into a coherent, generative, poetic system..." (73) Burgess (2001:4) notes that myths of the Trojan War would have been narrated in a variety of poetic genres and in non-metrical storytelling, as well as in visual art. This point has obvious application to non-Trojan War myth as well.

12. For a skeptical view of the possibility of Homeric allusion, see Ø. Andersen (1998).

13. Burgess (2006) 154-56.

phraseology was traditionally associated with specific narrative contexts."[14] This is similar to Georg Danek's argument that certain verbal formulations in the Homeric poems allude to other poetic narratives, which he believes would have been largely fixed, but still orally transmitted.[15] Danek thinks this type of allusion only rarely occurs in the Homeric poems, but I believe he is unduly skeptical about the ability of mythological and poetic traditions to preserve distinctive wording.

In the particular case of Typhoeus, Calvert Watkins has provided a compelling demonstration that the Greek tradition preserved one motif—the lashing or binding of Typhoeus—from the genesis of the myth to its textualization in archaic and classical sources, often expressed by distinctive vocabulary. The preservation of this detail shows that oral traditions can preserve imagery and diction in stable forms, and this opens up the possibility of scene-specific allusion within oral tradition through the use of distinctive imagery and diction. Watkins demonstrates that both the *Iliad* and the *Theogony* share the motif of lashing, expressed with similar diction in both poems. This motif, together with two additional elements which stem from this common tradition—fire and the groaning of the earth—forms a unified allusion. Watkins deals with the first element, as I will detail below; then I will consider the remaining two.

It is widely agreed that the Typhoeus myth entered Greece from Asia Minor, based on extensive parallels from Hittite texts found at Hattusa, in particular the Illuyankas myth. The

14. Burgess (2009) 61, in a chapter which is a revised version of the 2006 article.
15. Danek (2002) 16-17; see also Danek (1998) 366-68, 465-76.

Bronze Age date of these texts implies that the Greek tradition about Typhoeus, or at least elements of it, has a long history. Watkins argues that the transmission of the myth occurred in the mid-2nd millennium BCE in a situation of language contact between Mycenaean Greek and Hittite, perhaps in western Anatolia.[16] His starting point is the motif of lashing shared by all three archaic Greek sources for the Typhoeus myth, expressed in each case by a derivative of ἱμάσσω, a denominative verb formed from ἱμάς, 'thong'.[17] This is a rare word, and its appearances in narratives concerning Typhoeus are a significant fraction of its total occurrences in Greek. In the Illuyankas myth, the serpent is bound "with a cord" (*išḫimanta kaleliet*, *KTH* 321 §11). Watkins argues that Greek ἱμάς, 'thong' was so similar to Hittite *išḫimāš*, 'cord' (instrumental *išḫimanta*) in sound and meaning as to be a phonetic echo in the Greek version of the Hittite story. Noting that in Classical sources the motif of lashing is absent and the monster is bound instead (e.g. Αἴτνας ἐν μελαμφύλλοις δέδεται κορυφαῖς, Pindar *Pythian* 1.27), Watkins reconstructs a translation of Hittite *išḫimanta kaleliet* as Greek δῆσεν ἱμάντι/ἱμᾶσι (the Hittite instrumental does not distinguish singular or plural, so either is possible in in the Greek translation). At some point, the transmission of this phrase underwent a split involving the creation of two *figurae etymologicae*, δῆσεν δεσμῷ/δεσμοῖσι 'bound with bonds' and ἱμάσσεν ἱμάντι/ἱμᾶσι 'corded with cords'. The first branch preserved the semantics of binding, while the second preserved something of the sound of the Hittite original, but in the process created a new denominative verb (ἱμάσσω) whose meaning was restricted to that of its base noun.

16. Watkins (1995) 448-59.
17. *Iliad* 2.782 (ἱμάσσῃ), *Theogony* 857 (ἱμάσσας), and *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 340 (ἵμασε).

Watkins demonstrates that the Greek Typhoeus myth preserved the lashing/binding motif from its genesis, and shows that one branch of the tradition preserved distinctive vocabulary over centuries. Indeed, it seems that the lashing/binding motif was an essential element of Typhoeus' story, for it is present in every preserved archaic and classical version of the myth. For the motifs I will analyze below—fire and the groaning of the earth—I make no claim regarding when they entered the Typhoeus tradition. But their presence in both the *Iliad* and the *Theogony* indicates that these details were traditionally associated with Typhoeus, and more specifically with the particular scene of his combat with Zeus. Therefore, for us, who lack other access to the common tradition, the detailed narrative of the *Theogony* can illuminate the allusion, compressed into a pair of similes, in the *Iliad*.

In the *Theogony*, fire imagery is a recurrent feature of the Typhoeus episode. An initial description of Typhoeus characterizes him as a hundred-headed, fiery monster (*Theogony* 824-28):

> … ἐκ δέ οἱ ὤμων
> ἦν ἑκατὸν κεφαλαὶ ὄφιος, δεινοῖο δράκοντος,
> γλώσσῃσιν δνοφερῇσι λελιχμότες, ἐκ δέ οἱ ὄσσων
> θεσπεσίῃς κεφαλῇσιν ὑπ' ὀφρύσι πῦρ ἀμάρυσσεν·
> πασέων δ' ἐκ κεφαλέων πῦρ καίετο δερκομένοιο·
>
> … from his shoulders
> grew a hundred heads of a snake, a fearful dragon,
> with dark, flickering tongues, and from his eyes
> under the brows of his marvelous heads fire flashed,
> and fire burned from all his heads as he glared.

Fire flashes from Typhoeus' many eyes and burns from his heads; later sources make him a fire-breather.[18] When Zeus and Typhoeus meet in combat, fire spreads far and wide (*Theogony* 844-47):[19]

> καῦμα δ᾽ ὑπ᾽ ἀμφοτέρων κάτεχεν ἰοειδέα πόντον
> βροντῆς τε στεροπῆς τε, πυρός τ᾽ ἀπὸ τοῖο πελώρου,
> πρηστήρων ἀνέμων τε κεραυνοῦ τε φλεγέθοντος.
> ἔζεε δὲ χθὼν πᾶσα καὶ οὐρανὸς ἠδὲ θάλασσα·
>
> And burning heat from both of them gripped the dark blue sea,
> the heat of the thunder and lightning and the fire from the monster,
> of the scorching winds and the blazing thunderbolt.
> The whole earth seethed, and sky and sea …

This fire is universal in scale, or nearly so: it spreads across the sea, and causes the earth, sky and sea to "seethe." Earth, sea, and sky are three of the four regions that make up the archaic Greek universe; the fourth region is the underworld, and the effects of the combat there are described a few lines after the passage just quoted.[20]

At the climactic moment of the battle, Zeus takes up his weapons—thunder, lightning and blazing thunderbolt (βροντήν τε στεροπήν τε καὶ αἰθαλόεντα κεραυνόν, 854)—and burns Typhoeus' hundred heads (856). The monster falls, and a firestorm rises from his body and burns the earth (859-61); an elaborate simile uses imagery drawn from metalworking to describe

18. For Typhoeus as a fire-breather, see Aeschylus, *Prometheus Bound* 370-72, *Seven Against Thebes* 493; Apollodoros 1.6.3.
19. On the similarity of this passage to the *Iliad*'s simile, see Nimis (1987) 75-76. Nimis also mentions *Theogony* 859-61, which I discuss below.
20. On these regions as elements of the archaic Greek cosmos, see Kahn (1960) 134-37, Mondi (1986) 42n44. There are many archaic examples of a tripartite division of the universe, on which see Burkert (1992) 90-91.

how the earth melts and flows like tin in a smith's crucible or iron in the forge of Hephaistos (862-67).

In a general sense, the importance of fire in this episode corresponds to its role in the Iliadic passage. A more specific parallel lies in the fire's destructive effect upon the earth: in the *Iliad*, the earth is consumed by fire (νέμοιτο, 2.780), and in the *Theogony*, the fire melts the earth. Both passages share the idea of trauma caused to the earth, but in Hesiod the trauma is more severe and the image is elaborated by a simile. A second similarity is the huge scale of the fire: the "entire earth" burns in the *Iliad* (χθὼν πᾶσα, 2.781), and Hesiod, the sea, earth, and sky seethe from the heat (*Theogony* 847).

In his commentary on the *Theogony*, Martin West argues that during the battle fire is wielded solely by Zeus and not by Typhoeus. For West, indications that Typhoeus causes fire—such as the narrator's mention of "the fire from the monster" (πυρός τ' ἀπὸ τοῖο πελώρου, 845)—actually show that Typhoeus' body reflects flame after being struck by Zeus' thunderbolt.[21] Though in later sources Typhoeus fights with winds, West believes that here the "scorching winds" (πρηστήρων ἀνέμων, 846) belong to Zeus, and Typhoeus gains the power to cause winds only after his defeat.[22] The association of storm winds with the storm god Zeus is natural enough, and this connection appears earlier in the *Theogony*, in the Titanomachy, where Zeus raises a wind-driven thunderstorm (706-709) that spreads fire throughout the cosmos (692-700).[23] But

21. West (1966) on *Theogony* 845.
22. West (1966) on *Theogony* 846.
23. On the association of storm winds with Zeus in this scene and more generally, see Nagy (1979) 321-23.

this does not mean that the *Theogony* associates storm winds exclusively with Zeus. As Leonard Muellner has remarked, however, Typhoeus is "an Anti-Zeus" and shares in his attributes.[24] Thus, both figures employ fire and wind. Indeed, the heat that grips the sea when the combat begins is said to do so "from both" (ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων, 844); this is most naturally read as a statement that both Zeus and Typhoeus cause the heat. Their dual agency is further detailed by the list of the heat's sources in the following lines (845-46). The three terms which typically name Zeus' weapons—*brontē*, *steropē*, and *keraunos*—are interrupted by "the fire from the monster" and the "scorching winds."[25] Despite West's objections, the first must be understood as fire created by the monster himself. The power to generate winds, as we have seen, belongs to Zeus, but Typhoeus possesses this ability as well. Thus, the sequence of Zeus' weapons is broken by Typhoeus' fire and by the winds, a weapon wielded by both combatants. The intermixture of sources from both opponents is a verbal representation of their mixture in the battle, and the jumbled ordering hints at the chaos that spreads through the universe during the combat.

Later authors who make Typhoeus a fire-breather simply elaborate on the implications of this passage, rather than being "misled" as West argues.[26] Muellner's position, however, requires modification. As the episode begins, Typhoeus commands fire as a fitting rival to Zeus. But after his defeat, the monster loses this ability—the heat that melts the earth when he falls comes from Zeus' thunderbolt, not from Typhoeus himself. After being cast into Tartaros, the monster can only cause damp and threatening winds, no longer scorching blasts.

---

24. Muellner (1996) 89.
25. On these terms see West (1966) on *Theogony* 140.
26. West (1966) on *Theogony* 845.

In addition to fire imagery, the passages from the *Iliad* and the *Theogony* also both share the feature of the groaning of the earth. In both poems, this sound is expressed by a form of στεναχίζω/στοναχίζω or its compounds.[27] This complex of verbs is not particularly rare, but there are few instances where the earth is the subject of the verb (*Iliad* 2.95, 831, 834; *Theogony* 159, 843, 858), and in each poem two of the occurrences of the earth's groaning are found in the Typhoeus passages. The groaning of the earth, in other words, is particularly associated with Typhoeus. As noted above, in the *Iliad*, the earth's groaning opens and closes a ring which frames the second simile (ὑπεστενάχιζε, στεναχίζετο, *Iliad* 2.831, 834). In the *Theogony*, the earth first groans when Zeus rises to confront Typhoeus (*Theogony* 839-43):

> σκληρὸν δ' ἐβρόντησε καὶ ὄβριμον, ἀμφὶ δὲ γαῖα
> σμερδαλέον κονάβησε καὶ οὐρανὸς εὐρὺς ὕπερθε
> πόντος τ' Ὠκεανοῦ τε ῥοαὶ καὶ Τάρταρα γαίης.
> ποσσὶ δ' ὕπ' ἀθανάτοισι μέγας πελεμίζετ' Ὄλυμπος
> ὀρνυμένοιο ἄνακτος· ἐπεστονάχιζε δὲ γαῖα.
>
> He thundered harshly and heavily, and the earth around
> resounded terribly and the wide heaven above,
> and the sea and Ocean's streams and the nether parts of the earth.
> Great Olympus trembled beneath the divine feet
> of the lord as he rushed, and the earth groaned.

In the following lines, fire takes hold of the cosmos as Zeus and Typhoeus meet. Like that fire, the noise of the battle spreads throughout the universe. Earth, heaven, the sea, and the underworld, as well as the streams of Ocean, all "resound" from Zeus' thunder (κονάβησε, 840).[28] The noise continues in the following lines: ἔζεε (847), θυῖε (848), ῥιπῇ (849), and ἔνοσις (849)

27. On the variation of στεν-/στον- see Buttmann (1861) 498-500, West (1966) on *Theogony* 159.
28. Mondi (1986) 43.

all suggest cacophony. Typhoeus makes his own contribution to the sound of the battle. His hundred heads sometimes speak the language of the gods, but at other times emit the voices of a bull, lion, or dog; sometimes he hisses, so the mountains echo (830-35). The multiplicity of Typhoeus' voices is but one sign of the disorder that would attend his victory—he threatens to return the universe to a state of chaos in which the boundaries between the different regions of the cosmos would be erased.[29] Typhoeus' attack on Zeus threatens not only the political structure of the universe but also its physical structure; the two are intertwined. The earth's groaning is thus a localized instance of the universal noise of the combat, and signifies a moment when cosmic order is challenged.[30] In singling out the earth, however, the narrative gives special emphasis to her contribution to the sound of the battle, which is perhaps no surprise given her role in bringing the battle about.

The earth groans a second time when Typhoeus is defeated (*Theogony* 857-58):

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δή μιν δάμασε πληγῇσιν ἰμάσσας,
ἤριπε γυιωθείς, στονάχιζε δὲ γαῖα πελώρη·

But when indeed Zeus broke him, having lashed him with blows,
he fell, lamed, and the monstrous earth groaned.

At the climactic moment of the battle, Zeus lashes Typhoeus; the monster falls and the earth groans. Just after these lines, fire rising from the Typhoeus' fallen body melts the earth. As in the *Iliad* passage, the details of lashing, the earth's groaning, and fire are closely linked.

At two pivotal moments in the battle, the earth groans; each time fire ensues. The fire and the earth's groans are manifestations of the disorder into which Typhoeus' victory would plunge

29. Detienne and Vernant (1974) 117-19.
30. Nimis (1987) 76.

the entire universe. These details are central elements of the *Theogony*'s account of the battle, and this very centrality suggests that they were traditionally part of the episode. The *Iliad* passage could be recognized as an allusion to the combat simply from a general knowledge of the Typhoeus myth, but understanding the traditionality of the details mentioned allows better understanding of how the *Iliad* alludes to the myth and the implications of its doing so. The allusion makes the lashing of the earth around Typhoeus an echo of the combat, to be repeated whenever Zeus is angered (χωομένῳ, 2.782).[31] This passage is simultaneously a verbal, narrative, and thematic echo of the combat—that is, similar diction is used, actions are repeated (and re-repeated) between both contexts, and just as in the *Theogony*, the imagery points to the chaos with which Typhoeus threatens the cosmos. The difference in the *Iliad* passage is that Typhoeus is no longer a threat, but a defeated enemy who is repeatedly punished—he can no longer challenge Zeus.

Typhoeus and the Succession Myth

Typhoeus' challenge to Zeus is an episode within a larger struggle over the succession of kingship in heaven, known as the succession myth. This section will analyze Typhoeus' role in the succession myth by examining his characteristics in several Greek sources as well as the comparative evidence of closely related Hittite myths. My initial focus will be on Hesiod's *Theogony*. As I argued above, the *Iliad* does not allude directly to Hesiod, but an understanding of

31. On the repeated nature of Typhoeus' lashing, see Fontenrose (1959) 70-71. Walsh (2005:78n118) argues that χώομαι is semantically closely related to χόλος and μῆνις.

the earliest extant Greek version of the succession myth will help elucidate the *Iliad*'s allusion to Typhoeus. My analysis of the *Theogony* will demonstrate two points: first, that Typhoeus is an integral element of Hesiod's succession myth, and second, that he is represented as a resurgence of an earlier, more primitive stage of the universe's development. His victory, therefore, would throw the evolution of the cosmos into reverse, and would bring the universe into a disordered, chaotic state. I will then argue that the *Theogony*'s portrait of Typhoeus is echoed by other Greek sources, of which I will consider the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, an account preserved in a scholion to the *Iliad*, and the late version found in Apollodorus. Finally, I consider comparative data from Hittite myths in which a Typhoean figure challenges the ruling Storm God; these cross-cultural parallels reinforce the picture of Typhoeus as a threat not just to the supremacy of Zeus but even to the structure of the universe itself.

There has sometimes been doubt that the Typhoeus episode in the *Theogony* has any connection to the succession myth, and this has occasionally led to suspicion about the authenticity of the passage. Few scholars now would resort to condemning the passage as an interpolation, but I will begin by raising three features of the passage that have often been seen as inconsistencies, as they illustrate where the connections between the episode and the rest of the *Theogony* are least clear.[32] First, Tartaros is personified in this section, whereas before he was only a geographic location. A more serious issue is that Gaia is an enemy of Zeus in this part of the poem, whereas she otherwise supports him. Finally, the logic of the succession myth would seem

32. For a systematic treatment of the passage's authenticity see West (1966) 379-83; but note that West (1997: 300) regards the Typhoeus episode as a "separate, self-contained story" that does not fit well into the structure of the succession myth.

to require the passing of power from father to son, and Typhoeus is no son of Zeus, although his status as a "son" is thematically crucial.

First, Tartaros: his presence helps link the Typhoeus episode with the preceding Titanomachy. After the close of the Titanomachy (*Theogony* 722-819), Tartaros is presented as a region of the cosmos and described in elaborate detail; at the beginning of the Typhoeus episode, he appears as a male being capable of fathering a monstrous child. This development is not unprecedented within the poem. As West notes, Tartaros' ability to sexually reproduce is no more surprising than that of Gaia, Ouranos, Chaos, and so on.[33] Jenny Strauss Clay sees in Tartaros a process of evolution that parallels the development of the cosmos—first he is simply the neuter plural *Tartara* (*Theogony* 119), which signifies the interior of the earth; when Zeus imprisons the Titans, the space receives more differentiation; and then the final step of personification occurs with the birth of Typhoeus.[34] Tartaros' development, however, should not be overstated. The neuter plural *Tartara* also appears in the Typhoeus episode, apparently signifying once more the interior parts of the earth (*Theogony* 841). As a character, Tartaros' only action is to mate with Gaia (*Theogony* 821-22):

> ὁπλότατον τέκε παῖδα Τυφωέα Γαῖα πελώρη
> Ταρτάρου ἐν φιλότητι διὰ χρυσῆν Ἀφροδίτην·
>
> monstrous Gaia bore the very last of her children, Typhoeus,
> by mating with Tartaros through golden Aphrodite.

33. West (1966) on *Theogony* 822.
34. Clay (2003) 15-16.

The emphasis here is on Gaia's action of bearing Typhoeus; Tartaros and Aphrodite receive equal responsibility in bringing about Gaia's pregnancy. Tartaros' personification is not complex, and his agency is limited, but his appearance here indicates something important about the nature of Gaia's son and her strategy in bringing him to light. After he contains within himself the Titanic opponents of Zeus, Tartaros produces another opponent to Zeus. He has, in a sense, reproduced the Titans, concentrated into a single figure.[35] While in purely chronological terms Typhoeus is younger than Zeus, as a first generation descendant of Gaia and Tartaros he belongs to an older stage of cosmic development, that of the Titans. The pairing of Gaia and Tartaros inverts that of Gaia and Ouranos—the Titans are children of Earth and Heaven, Typhoeus is a child of Earth and the Netherworld. The birth of Typhoeus, then, is an attempt to return to the beginnings of things, and to restart the development of the cosmos from a different set of primordial roots.

Another issue raised by some critics of the episode is that Gaia's support of Typhoeus seems inconsistent with her actions elsewhere in the poem.[36] She helps Zeus overthrow Kronos by suggesting he bring the Hundred-handers out from Tartaros to provide the crucial help in fighting the Titans; yet directly after this success she gives birth to Typhoeus, who comes close to supplanting Zeus as the ruler of gods and men. After Typhoeus' defeat, Gaia once again supports Zeus. This inconsistency has in the past led to the suggestion that the Typhoeus section should be excised, which would make Gaia a consistent supporter of Zeus.

35. See Mondi (1990) 184.
36. e.g., Solmsen (1949) 53n172.

Gaia's behavior, however, is both consistent and understandable. In bringing forth a challenger to Zeus, Gaia supports the principle of generational succession, just as she has in supporting Kronos against Ouranos and Zeus against Kronos. Indeed, as the primordial female, Gaia is a principle of fecundity, change, and generational succession; it is in her nature to promote the replacement of the established generation with a younger one.[37] The oddity, then, is not that Gaia opposes Zeus, for on the pattern of the first two stages of the succession myth, we should expect Gaia to support a challenger to Zeus; the anomaly is that Gaia comes to support Zeus after Typhoeus is disposed of. In other words, what needs to be explained is not Gaia's opposition to Zeus, but her decision to aid him in consolidating his power. As I will show below, the defeat of Typhoeus plays a crucial role in motivating Gaia's eventual support of Zeus.

A third feature of the episode often seen as inconsistent with the rest of the *Theogony* and as a break with the logic of the succession myth is that Typhoeus is not a son of Zeus. It is crucial to the episode, however, that Typhoeus not be the child of Zeus. The displacement of generational succession outside Zeus' direct line allows him to suppress a challenge to his rule without committing violence towards his own children. On the pattern of the earlier stages of the succession myth, a challenge from a son would succeed—and even after the defeat of Typhoeus, this expectation is still active and motivates the swallowing of the goddess Mētis. On the other hand, if Zeus were able to break the pattern by defeating his own son, he would preserve his kingship through violence towards his own offspring. Ouranos' and Kronos' attempts to prevent the births of their children are unjust acts which warrant revenge; if Zeus were to follow suit, his

37. Clay (2003) 17-18.

kingship would be tainted with injustice. In fact, the poem shies away from associating intrafamilial violence too closely with Zeus. The poem does not describe in any detail the incident in which Kronos disgorges his children, even though this is when Zeus gains kingly power, having conquered Kronos "through wiles and force" (τέχνῃσι βίηφί τε, *Theogony* 496). Presumably a too detailed account of Zeus' use of violence against his father would have presented him in an unfavorable light, even though Kronos' misdeeds against his children demand recompense.[38] Because Typhoeus is not Zeus' offspring, his attack does not come in revenge for the crimes of his parent; it is instead an unprovoked attack against a legitimate ruler. Thus, the poem not only keeps Zeus apart from any unjust actions towards his children, but also implies that a challenge to his rule is unjust. Even before Zeus swallows the goddess Mētis, definitively breaking the cycle of divine succession, the poem signals through the defeat of Typhoeus that Zeus' rule will remain intact.

A closer examination of the manner in which Zeus defeats Typhoeus will show how this episode demonstrates Zeus' mastery of *mētis*, and so anticipates his swallowing of the goddess. The pivotal moment of the confrontation with Typhoeus is narrated in a counterfactual condition (*Theogony* 836-38):

> καί νύ κεν ἔπλετο ἔργον ἀμήχανον ἤματι κείνῳ
> καί κεν ὅ γε θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἄναξεν,
> εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὀξὺ νόησε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε.
>
> And indeed a thing past help would have occurred on that day
> and he would have been king over mortals and immortals,
> if the father of men and gods had not recognized sharply.

38. Forsyth (1987) 85-87.

Counterfactuals are a common feature in Homeric epic. The majority are formed with the order and diction we see here (apodosis first, introduced by καί νύ κεν, then a negative protasis introduced by εἰ μὴ ἄρ').[39] In six of these conditions, the apodosis is prevented because someone is said to "recognize sharply" (ὀξὺ νόησε).[40] In these cases, the intervention of the character who "recognizes" effects a dramatic change in the direction of the plot.[41] In one instance, a Trojan reversal would have occurred at the hands of Diomedes, if Zeus had not prevented it (*Iliad* 8.130-31). The intervention can avert an event that would contravene epic tradition and thus cannot be allowed to happen, such as the death of a hero who is not fated to die within the primary fabula of the *Iliad*. Paris is saved from death at the hands of Menelaos when Aphrodite "recognizes sharply" (*Iliad* 3.373). Aineias, who is destined to live on beyond the end of the Trojan War, is saved twice when a god "recognizes sharply," first by Aphrodite (*Iliad* 5.311), and later by Poseidon (*Iliad* 20.290). Nestor is rescued when Diomedes recognizes Hektor (*Iliad* 8.91). In another example, what is prevented is not the death of a hero but of an anonymous number of Trojan allies. After killing seven Lykians, Odysseus is prevented from killing still more when Hektor recognizes him (*Iliad* 5.680).

The counterfactual in the *Theogony* is like the Iliadic examples in several respects. It would clearly be contrary to the established "facts" of Greek religion if Typhoeus overthrew Zeus, so this outcome must be averted, and as the *Theogony* is the story of how Zeus established

39. On counterfactual conditions in Homer, see DeJong (1987) 68-81, Lang (1989), Louden (1993).
40. *Iliad* 3.373-74, 5.311-12, 5.680, 8.91, 8.132, 20.290.
41. Cf. Louden (1993) 184.

his rule over gods and men, it is appropriate that he is the one to restore the proper course of the plot. Yet this counterfactual differs from the Homeric examples in an important way. In each of the cases in the *Iliad*, the hero or god who "recognizes sharply" saves another character from danger, and usually enters the action suddenly to do so.[42] For instance, when Aphrodite rescues Aineias from Diomedes (*Iliad* 5.311-18), she has been absent from the narrative for some time. In Book 8 (*Iliad* 8.90-91), the phrase introduces Diomedes to the narrative of that day's battle. But in the *Theogony*, while Zeus has not yet been an active presence, the episode is introduced by a reminder of Zeus' prowess: "but when Zeus had driven the Titans from heaven..."(αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Τιτῆνας ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐξέλασεν Ζεύς, *Theogony* 820). Further, it is clear almost from the beginning of the episode that Typhoeus is going to challenge the rule of Zeus; it is as though he has been born specifically to be a rebel against the established order.[43] And the character whom Zeus saves is none other than himself.

The Homeric and Hesiodic uses of the phrase *oxu noēse* differ. In the Homeric examples, this phrase seems fairly colorless. It does not refer to a character's general ability to perceive well, but only indicates that they have perceived at one particular pivotal moment. It is a formulaic way of introducing a new character into a situation that would have been lost without his intervention. But in the case of Zeus, the verb *noēse* does not bring a new participant into the

42. See Louden (1993) 184.
43. Compare the version found in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (307-54), where Hera gives birth to Typhoeus as a response to the birth of Athene; Hera wishes for him to be "stronger than Zeus by as much as far-seeing Zeus is stronger than Kronos" (ἀλλ' ὅ γε φέρτερος ἔστω, ὅσον Κρόνου εὐρύοπα Ζεύς, *H. Hymn to Apollo* 339).

scene. The phrase "sharply recognized" is not performing its usual Homeric function in the Hesiodic passage.

I suggest that unlike the Iliadic occurrences of this phrase, in the *Theogony* "recognizing sharply" is an indication of Zeus' general mental acuity. In each stage of the succession myth, *mētis*, "cunning intelligence," plays a crucial role in enabling the younger generation to replace the older.[44] When Ouranos prevents his children from being born, Gaia contrives a "crafty and bad device" (δολίην δὲ κακὴν ἐπεφράσσατο τέχνην, 160), creating the *genos* of adamant and fashioning a sickle from it. This is the first crafted object, the first product of *tekhnē*; while Gaia is able to simply produce the sickle, the tool is normally a product of metalworking, a craft associated with *mētis*.[45] Gaia gives the sickle to Kronos and hides him in ambush, instructing him in the "whole trick" (δόλον ... πάντα, 175). Kronos' victory is both an outwitting and an overpowering of his father, enabled by Gaia, who gives Kronos the crucial instructions that guide him to victory. In the second stage of the succession myth, Zeus' overthrow of Kronos, *mētis* again plays a crucial role. Kronos swallows his children as soon as they are born, appropriating for himself the reproductive role of Gaia in the previous round of the cycle, but Gaia comes up with a plan (*mētis*, *Theogony* 478) in response. Here perception, or more precisely, a lack of perception, brings about Kronos' downfall (*Theogony* 487-91):

> τὸν τόθ' ἑλὼν χείρεσσιν ἐὴν ἐσκάτθετο νηδὺν
> σχέτλιος· οὐδ' ἐνόησε μετὰ φρεσίν, ὥς οἱ ὀπίσσω

44. On the role of *mētis* in the *Theogony* see Detienne and Vernant (1974) 117-26, Muellner (1996) 61-93.
45. Detienne and Vernant (1974) 140-41, 259-73. Clay (2003) 17n14 observes that the sickle is "the first manufactured object."

ἀντὶ λίθου ἑὸς υἱὸς ἀνίκητος καὶ ἀκηδὴς
λείπεθ', ὅ μιν τάχ' ἔμελλε βίῃ καὶ χερσὶ δαμάσσας
τιμῆς ἐξελάειν, ὃ δ' ἐν ἀθανάτοισι ἀνάξειν.

Then taking it in his hands he put it in his belly,
pitilessly, but he did not recognize in his wits that
instead of a stone, his son, unconquered and untroubled,
stayed outside, who would soon break him with violent hands
and take his rank, and would lord it over the immortals.

Kronos disoes not recognize (οὐδ' ἐνόησε μετὰ φρεσίν) the *mētis* devised by Gaia, and so swallows a stone rather than his son, in contrast to Zeus who *oxu noēse* (*Theogony* 838) the threat posed by Typhoeus. Gaia's wiles are superior to Kronos', and this opens the way for Zeus to overthrow him with force (βίῃ καὶ χερσὶ, *Theogony* 490). This combat actually combines *mētis* and *biē*, since Zeus' weapon, the thunderbolt, is another object produced by *tekhnē* that was once concealed in the earth, like Kronos' sickle.

The first two stages of the succession myth are made possible because Gaia instructs the younger gods, giving them the cunning tactics they need to succeed. This precedent sets up an expectation that the contest between Typhoeus and Zeus will be another contest of cunning intelligence and force. The multiple voices of Typhoeus, imitating men, gods, and beasts, already discussed above as signs of disorder, are at the same time signs of his cunning; later versions of the story will expand his multiple voices into the ability to change into multiple shapes, producing a more visible marker of cunning.[46] He combines trickery and might, making him a potential successor to Kronos and Zeus. But Typhoeus fails, because Zeus recognizes him. There is more to this than the simple idea that Zeus notices Typhoeus before he can take effective

46. Detienne and Vernant (1974) 116-17, Muellner (1996) 88.

action.[47]Hesiod portrays Zeus as preeminent in *mētis* by having him "recognize" Typhoeus at a point in the story where Kronos failed to recognize the trick of the stone.

Zeus' timely recognition of Typhoeus is more of an assertion of his superiority in *mētis* than a simple illustration of it. Zeus recognizes Typhoeus, but it is not explained how he is able to notice the monster just in time to defeat him, nor is it explained why this moment is the right time to notice the monster. Zeus simply recognizes and then defeats him. Typhoeus' motives and actions are also somewhat opaque. In an earlier stage of the succession myth, when Kronos ambushes Ouranos with the sickle, the younger god uses *mētis* to defeat the older, but aside from Typhoeus' attributes, we have no indication that he employs cunning. Even though the previous rounds of the succession myth have primed expectations for a contest of *mētis* and *biē*, the *Theogony* portrays the battle largely as a physical conflict. *Mētis* is for the most part suppressed, and only makes an appearance in the act of noticing Typhoeus and in the nature of Zeus' weapon, the thunderbolt. The effect is to create a simple and unassailable statement of Zeus' superiority in *mētis*. Unlike when he challenged Kronos, he does not receive advice or a plan from Gaia; he recognizes the threat that Typhoeus poses without assistance. His self-sufficiency in *mētis* is paralleled by his self-sufficiency in *biē*; he no longer requires the assistance of his fellow Olympians or the Hundred-handers. Zeus appears in this episode as a complete hero who has

47. Here the *Theogony* may be countering a tradition such as the one we find in the theogony attributed to Epimenides (*FGrHist* 457 F 8), where Typhoeus gains an initial victory by sneaking into Zeus' palace while he is asleep. Zeus then must seek help from other gods to regain his position. A similar narrative is found in the Hittite Illuyankas myth. West (1999: 304) notes a resemblance to Anzu's seizure of power from Enlil while the latter is bathing.

fully assimilated both guile and might.[48] This episode thus anticipates his later assimilation of the goddess Mētis, whom he swallows after having "beguiled her wits by a trick, with wily words" (δόλῳ φρένας ἐξαπατήσας/αἰμυλίοισι λόγοισιν, 889-90); he is, in other words, already superior in cunning to Cunning herself.

In addition to demonstrating Zeus' mastery of *mētis*, the Typhoeus episode leads to the closure of the succession myth in a second way, through the figure of Gaia. With the defeat of her last child (ὁπλότατον…παῖδα Τυφωέα, 821), Gaia's encouragement of generational change among the gods comes to an end. With the creation of Typhoeus, Gaia had attempted to restart the development of the universe from herself and Tartaros, an alternate pair of primordial powers, rather than herself and Ouranos; when this strategy fails, she assists Zeus in consolidating his power. Because Zeus is able to defeat Typhoeus, we and Gaia infer that he will be able to defeat any other successor she may produce. This inference is supported by the fact that Gaia takes steps to safeguard Zeus' power. Just after the Typhoeus episode concludes with a description of Typhoeus, now confined to Tartaros, as a source of baneful winds for mortals, the Olympian gods acclaim Zeus as their ruler, on Gaia's advice (Γαίης φραδμοσύνῃσιν, 884).[49] Moreover, along with Ouranos, she reveals Mētis' potential to bear a son who would succeed Zeus and instructs him to swallow the goddess. Gaia and Ouranos reveal this information so that "no one but Zeus would hold kingly power among the everlasting gods" (ἵνα μὴ βασιληίδα τιμὴν/ἄλλος ἔχοι Διὸς ἀντὶ θεῶν αἰειγενετάων, 892-93).

---

48. On *mētis* and *biē* as aspects of the hero see Nagy (1979) 45-49; Cook (1999) 149-67.
49. Scully (1998: 167) notes that the gods' acclamation legitimates Zeus' rule through the consent of the governed.

My analysis has shown that in the *Theogony* Typhoeus is fully integrated into the succession myth. Zeus' victory over Typhoeus demonstrates his possession of *mētis* and *biē*, the very qualities which drive earlier stages of the succession myth and which enable Zeus to bring an end to generational succession among the gods. Typhoeus not only threatens the political order of things, in that his victory would end the rule of Zeus, but he also endangers the structure of the physical universe—he threatens the cosmos with devolution. As the child of Gaia and Tartaros he belongs to a conceptually earlier generation than Zeus, and one sprung from different primordial roots than the Olympians. At the same time, Typhoeus is a distillation of the Titans imprisoned within his father Tartaros. If Typhoeus should gain primacy over the gods, the result would be a return to an earlier stage of cosmic development. The differentiated and organized universe that has developed by the time of Zeus' victory would be thrown into chaos and disorder.

This portrait of Typhoeus as a threat to throw the development of the cosmos into reverse also underlies his depiction in Greek sources other than the *Theogony*. In the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, Typhaon (as he is consistently called in this hymn) is not the child of Gaia, but is instead produced parthenogenetically by Hera. In anger at the birth of Athene, Hera withdraws from Zeus and the other gods, and vows to produce a child who "will excel among the immortals" (ὅς κε θεοῖσι μεταπρέποι ἀθανάτοισιν, *H. Hymn to Apollo* 327). She prays to Gaia, Ouranos, and the Titans for a child who will be "stronger than Zeus by as much as far-seeing Zeus is stronger than Kronos" (ἀλλ' ὅ γε φέρτερος ἔστω, ὅσον Κρόνου εὐρύοπα Ζεύς, *H. Hymn to Apollo* 339). These gods grant her prayer, and after Typhaon is born, Hera entrusts him to

Python, who becomes the main focus of the narrative. Typhaon is thus a model for Python, and Apollo's slaying of Python is a doublet of his father's victory over Typhaon.[50] This version of the Typhoeus myth, in which Hera wishes for her child to challenge Zeus in just the way that Zeus challenged Kronos, has a clear connection to the struggle over divine succession. As in the Hesiodic account of Typhoeus, here Zeus is not the parent of the challenger to his throne. While Hera poses her generation of Typhaon as a response to Zeus' giving birth to Athene, it is at the same time a return to a method of reproduction—female parthenogenesis—that characterized the early development of the universe. The *Hymn to Apollo*, then, characterizes the way in which Typhaon is brought to light as primitive and monstrous.[51] Hera's engendering of Typhaon is supported by Gaia, Ouranos, and the Titans; while these older generations of gods are not described as literally participating in the generation of Typhaon, they seem to provide an essential impetus to Hera's asexual reproduction. Typhaon is a member of a younger generation than Zeus, but at the same time, he is developmentally older than the Olympians. Like the *Theogony*, the hymn represents Typhaon as a resurgence of an earlier stage of the universe's development, whose victory would return the universe to that state.

Hera is once again instrumental in bringing about Typhoeus' birth in an account preserved in a scholion to the *Iliad*.[52] The scholion itself is late, but some of its features may go back to archaic tradition.[53] After Gaia, angry because the gods have destroyed the Gigantes,

50. See Mondi (1990) 186-87.
51. On the primitive and even monstrous nature of parthenogenesis, see Clay (2003) 16, 28n46.
52. Scholion bT on *Iliad* 2.783.
53. See Gantz (1993: 51) on the date of the tradition reported by the scholion.

complains to Hera about Zeus, Hera goes to Kronos and obtains from him two eggs smeared with his semen, which she then buries in Arimon, a region of Kilikia. Typhoeus is born from one of the eggs.[54] Hera, however, has reconciled with Zeus, and tells him all; Zeus then thunderbolts Typhon, and places him under Aitna. In this version, as in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, Hera cooperates with gods from older generations to produce Typhon. She is not, however, the mother, but plays a central role in bringing him to light. If anyone is Typhon's parent, it is Kronos, through an odd reproductive process which is simultaneously parthenogenetic, in that only one parent is involved, but also sexual, in that an egg is combined with semen. Gaia plays a role as a kind of womb and is so a quasi-mother of Typhoeus; she also sets the story in motion by complaining to Hera about Zeus. This version of the myth avoids the problem of having Zeus defeat his son by making someone else, in this case Kronos, the male parent, but brings in Hera as a female quasi-parent to make Typhoeus more clearly the member of a younger generation, which strengthens Typhoeus' status as a "son" of Zeus.

In the version of Apollodoros (1.6.3), Gē, enraged by the defeat of the Gigantes, mates with Tartaros to produce Typhon. Typhon's body combines a human form with many animal shapes, and he is so large that his head often brushes the stars. He attacks heaven, and the gods flee to Egypt in fright, changing their forms to animals as they are pursued. Zeus pelts Typhon with thunderbolts, and strikes him with an adamantine sickle. Zeus pursues the wounded Typhon to Mount Kasios in Syria, and Typhon is able to wrap Zeus in his coils, steal the sickle, and sever the sinews of Zeus' hands and feet. Typhon carries Zeus to the Korykian cave in

54. The role of eggs in this account reflects Orphic influence; see Kirk (1983) 59-60.

Kilikia, and places Zeus and his sinews there under the guard of the dragoness Delphynē. Hermes and Aigipan steal the sinews and restore them to Zeus, who mounts his chariot and renews the battle. Typhon flees to Nysa, where the Fates trick him into eating "ephemeral fruits" (τῶν ἐφημέρων καρπῶν) which steal his strength away. After Zeus and Typhon fight at Mount Haemus in Thrace, Typhon flees to Sicily, and Zeus throws Mount Aitna upon him.

Apollodoros does not connect this episode explicitly to divine succession. Gē's motivation for engendering Typhon, however, is her anger at the defeat of the Gigantes; in turn, Gē gave birth to the Gigantes to get revenge for the defeat of the Titans (Apollodoros 1.6.1). In other words, Typhon's attack can ultimately be traced to Zeus' acquisition of power. As in Hesiod, Typhon's parents are Gē and Tartaros; the monstrous child is thus marked as a member of a developmentally earlier generation of gods than Zeus, though in terms of pure chronology he is younger. Typhon's body brings together and so confuses different regions of space—standing on the earth, he is so tall that his head often brushes the stars, bringing together above and below; his hands stretch out to the sunset and the sunrise, bringing together east and west.[55] Typhon's attempt to displace Zeus, if successful, would lead to an even greater fusion of distinct cosmic regions, as the child of the lower regions of the universe—the earth and the netherworld—tries to storm the highest part of the cosmos, and to bring heaven under the dominion of the lower regions.[56] Zeus' final victory over Typhon, as Apollodorus tells it, comes when Aitna is thrown on top of the monster. Henceforth, Typhon will be confined to the interior

55. Apollodoros 1.6.3: ἡ δὲ κεφαλὴ πολλάκις καὶ τῶν ἄστρων ἔψαυε·χεῖρας δὲ εἶχε τὴν μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν ἑσπέραν ἐκτεινομένην τὴν δὲ ἐπὶ τὰς ἀνατολάς.
56. See Mondi (1990) 183-84.

of the earth, and will no longer threaten to rejoin the separate regions of the cosmos into a disordered unity.

Apollodoros' account ranges widely over the eastern Mediterranean, with action taking place in Egypt, Mount Kasios, and Kilikia. These settings are a reminder that Typhoeus belongs to a widely diffused tradition, and is not an exclusively Greek property. As I discussed above, the myth was probably transmitted in a situation of intercultural contact between Mycenaean Greeks and Anatolians in the mid-second millennium BCE, but this need not have been the only time nor the only place in which the myth was transmitted, and indeed the direction of transmission need not have been solely towards Greece.

Three Hittite texts in particular have often been raised as parallels to and potential influences upon the Greek Typhoeus myth. Each of these texts come from the cuneiform archive at the Hittite capital of Hattusa. The physical texts date from the period 1400-1200 BCE, but often preserve older material. The first two, the *Song of Kumarbi* and the *Song of Ullikummi*, belong to a group of texts known as the Kumarbi Cycle, which deal with the establishment of the storm god Tessub as king of the gods and the attempts of the former king Kumarbi to regain power by creating offspring to challenge Tessub.[57] These texts are written in the Hittite language, but tell myths translated or adapted from Hurrian, the language of a people inhabiting a large area in northern Syria and northern Mesopotamia. The third text relates two versions of the Illuyankas myth, which concerns the defeat of the Storm God (as the supreme deity of the

57. See Barnett (1945); Güterbock (1948); Fontenrose (1959) 211-15; Walcot (1966) 1-14; West (1966) 21-22, 381-82; Burkert (1979) 20-22; West (1996) 278-80, 300, Csapo (2005) on parallels between the Kumarbi Cycle and Hesiod and other versions of the Typhoeus myth.

Hittite pantheon is called in this text) by a serpent (*illuyankas* is not a proper name but the Hittite common noun form 'serpent') and the Storm God's recovery of power through the assistance of a mortal helper.[58]

Before I discuss these texts in more detail, I should note I consider it unlikely that the Greek Typhoeus myth was adapted directly from these texts. Hittite mythology was probably not transmitted to Bronze Age Greece through a textual medium. Transmission of Hittite texts to archaic Greece is even more implausible, as Hattusa was destroyed long before the archaic period. The texts of the *Song of Kumarbi* and the *Song of Ullikummi* are only one representation of myths that no doubt took many forms in oral tradition, and underwent alteration through the passage of time; and they were certainly altered and adapted in the course of their transmission into the Greek world.[59] The specific form of the Hittite texts does not matter so much as the testimony they provide of a body of Near Eastern narrative that influenced Greek theogonic poetry. Furthermore, a focus on texts has often encouraged scholars to try to determine a particular point in time when a myth was brought into Greece. Instead, we should imagine a long history of interaction between Greece and the Near East, with reciprocal influence on mythic narratives and religion. The Typhoeus myth need not have a single source, especially not a single

58. For discussions of the parallels between the Illuyankas myth and Greek traditions about Typhoeus, see Porzig (1930), Dornseiff (1933), Heubeck (1955), Fontenrose (1959) 121-25, Vian (1960) 17-37, Lesky (1966) 356-71, Walcot (1966) 14-16, West (1966) 391, Kirk (1970) 220-21, Burkert (1979) 7-10, Watkins (1995) 448-59, Csapo (2005).
59. See Mondi (1990) 150.

textual source, and each version of the Typhoeus myth may reflect Near Eastern material in different ways.[60]

The *Song of Kumarbi* concerns the passing of "kingship in heaven" through successive generations of gods.[61] Similarities to the *Theogony* have long been noted. As the text opens, Alalu is king in heaven. After nine years, Alalu's cupbearer Anu ("Sky") attacks Alalu, who flees. Anu now reigns as king of the gods, but after nine years he is attacked by his cupbearer Kumarbi, who is the son of Alalu. Anu flees, but Kumarbi pursues Anu, seizes him, and bites off and swallows Anu's genitals. Anu now informs Kumarbi that he is impregnated with three dreadful gods, and disappears into the sky. Kumarbi spits out a mixture of spittle and semen, and as it strikes the ground, it produces mountains, rivers, and gods, but some of Anu's semen remains inside. Kumarbi consults with Ea, a god of fresh water and a trickster figure, for advice on how to give birth. A male god named Kazal is born, apparently by emerging from Kumarbi's skull, and Kumarbi asks to be given his son to eat. The text is fragmentary at this point, but it seems that Kumarbi is given a stone to eat in place of his son, which he then spits out and sets down somewhere on the earth to be a cult object. Ea gives Kumarbi to doctors who heal his head and feed him. The storm god Teshub is still inside Kumarbi, and is able to communicate with Anu, who advises Teshub on the best way to come out from Kumarbi's body. Teshub emerges from Kumarbi's "good place" (which is likely a euphemism for his penis). The text, which is

60. See Burkert (1986) 20, Mondi (1990) 151-57, and Csapo (2005) 76-79 for approaches that emphasize the role of intercultural contact over a sustained period and the multiplicity of influences upon Greek mythic ideas.
61. *CTH* 344, translation in *ANET* 120-21.

fragmentary in places, ends with the notice of two children being born to Earth in the Apsu (an underground sea), who may be intended to pose a threat to Teshub. The text does not preserve the final outcome of the conflict between Kumarbi and Teshub, but it is certain that Teshub assumes his place at the head of the Hittte pantheon.

Parallels to the *Theogony* are unmistakable. Most obviously, there is the succession of kingship through three generations from a personified sky (Anu/Ouranos) to a weather god (Teshub/Zeus). This succession, however, is not directly from father to son, as in the *Theogony*, but involves two parallel royal lineages—the son of Alalu is not Anu, but Kumarbi, and the son of Anu is Teshub, not Kumarbi. The link between these lineages, Kumarbi's ingestion of Anu's genitals and subsequent pregnancy, parallels the *Theogony*'s motifs of castration and swallowing of offspring, and, if the reconstruction can be trusted, there is also the swallowing of a stone which is later vomited up and made into a cult object, in much the same way as the stone Kronos swallows in place of Zeus is made into a *sēma* at Delphi (*Theogony* 498-500). After being deposed, Kumarbi becomes a netherworld god, like Kronos; Teshub is the god of storm and sky, like Zeus.[62]

After Teshub is established as the head of the pantheon his rule faces several challenges. The *Song of Ullikummi* is one of several texts of the Kumarbi cycle in which Kumarbi fathers offspring to dethrone the Storm God.[63] As the *Song of Ullikummi* begins, Kumarbi contemplates how to overthrow Teshub. Kumarbi mates with a rock, and the stone child Ullikummi is born

62. See the more extensive comparison in West (1999) 278-79, with references.
63. *CTH* 345, translation in *ANET* 121-25.

from the union. Ullikummi is placed upon the right shoulder of Ubelluri, a god who supports earth and sky. After fifteen days, Ullikummi grows to enormous size: the sea only reaches to his waist. The Sun God notices Ullikummi and reports the news to Teshub, who travels to Mount Kasios to view the stone child. Teshub despairs at the sight. Ishtar attempts to seduce Ullikummi, but he is impervious to her charms. Ullkummi has now grown so large that his head stands before the gates of the city of the gods. Teshub attacks, but his weapons have no effect, and he flees heaven. Teshub takes refuge with the god Ea, who goes to consult with Ubelluri. It turns out that Ubelluri has little awareness of the upheaval around him, just as he was unaware when heaven and earth with severed with a copper knife. Ubelluri has, however, noticed that his right shoulder is a bit sore. Ea suggests that the same copper knife be used to cut Ullikummi away from Ubelluri's shoulder. Once this is done, the stone monster is vulnerable, and under Teshub's leadership, the gods attack Ullikummi and defeat him.

Ullikummi is generally seen as a parallel to Typhoeus. Both are monstrous challengers who would displace the present ruler of the gods and take kingship for themselves; both are the offspring of a generation before the present ruler. The creation of Ullikummi through Kumarbi's impregnation of a rock resembles the account of the Iliadic scholion in which Typhoeus is born from an egg buried in the earth after being impregnated by Kronos.[64] The copper knife used to sever Ullikummi's feet has often been seen as a parallel to the sickle used to castrate Kronos in the *Theogony*.[65] The parallels to the non-Hesiodic versions of the Typhoeus episode are striking:

---

64. See López-Ruiz (2010) 111.
65. E.g., Walcot (1966) 8; note that in Apollodoros, Zeus attacks Typhon with an adamantine sickle.

the temporary defeat of Teshub calls to mind Apollodoros' account, as does the location of the battle with Ullikummi at Mount Kasios. Teshub first views Ullikummi from the Syrian mountain, and it is there, according to Apollodoros, that Typhon cuts away Zeus' sinews. Ullikummi's gigantic size is another point of resemblance with Apollodoros' description of Typhon, who towered above mountains and often brushed the stars with his head (Apollodoros 1.6.3). Ullikummi grows from the foundation of the earth through the sea up into the air to heaven itself—he blurs distinctions between distinct realms simply with his body.[66]

Another challenge to the Storm God formed the subject of the Illuyankas myth, which is preserved in two versions by a single Hittite text.[67] Each version opens with the defeat of the Storm God (as the chief god of the Hittite pantheon is called in this text) by a serpent (*illuyankas*). The defeated Storm God holds a divine council, and afterwards, his daughter, the goddess Inara, secures the aid of a mortal man named Hupasiya by sleeping with him. Inara conceals Hupasiya in a hole, and then invites the serpent to a feast, where the serpent becomes incapacitated from excessive food and drink. Hupasiya then binds the serpent with a cord; the Storm God appears, and kills the serpent. Inara builds a house on a rock outcropping and settles Hupasiya there, instructing him not to look out the window so he will not see his wife and children. Hupasiya disobeys Inara's instructions, and he begs the goddess to let him return to his family. Here the text breaks off, and it is not clear how this version ends. The second version again begins with the defeat of the Storm God, whose heart and eyes are removed by the serpent.

---

66. Mondi (1990) 183.
67. *CTH* 321, translation in *ANET* 125-26; see also Beckman (1982) for text and translation.

The Storm God marries a mortal woman and has a son. After the son has grown, he marries the daughter of the serpent and, following his father's instructions, asks for the Storm God's heart and eyes as a bride price. He returns the heart and eyes to his father. With his strength restored, the Storm God does battle with the serpent. As the battle turns in the Storm God's favor, his son asks to be killed along with the serpent, and the Storm God does so.

Like Ullikummi, the serpent is often seen as a parallel to Typhoeus.[68] Here, though, it should be noted that the Illuyankas myth is independent from the texts of the Kumarbi cycle, and it has no explicit connection to other myths about the succession of kingship in heaven; the serpent desires rule for himself and takes it, but it is not clear whose offspring he may be. On the other hand, the basic plot of the myths in this text is similar to the *Song of Ullikummi*: the Storm God is challenged and temporarily defeated by a monstrous adversary. The serpent could be another child of Kumarbi created to unseat the Storm God. In any case, it is clear that the Illuyankas myth influenced the Typhoeus myth; as I have discussed above, Calvert Watkins has shown that the language of "lashing" used in connection with Typhoeus in archaic Greek poetry can be traced back to the binding of the serpent with a cord in the Illuyankas myth.[69] Once again the parallels with Apollodoros' version of the myth are striking: in both, the storm god suffers a defeat, and the removal of vital parts of his body renders him powerless. Only through the intercession of a helper can the storm god regain his strength and defeat his adversary. Trickery plays a role in both versions of the Illuyankas myth: in the first, Inara gets the serpent drunk, and

68. See Burkert (1979) 7-10 and Csapo (2005) 74-75.
69. Watkins (1995) 448-59.

Hupasiya leaps out from ambush; in the second, the Storm God's son deceives the serpent and marries his daughter. In Apollodoros' version, trickery plays a role in Hermes' theft of Zeus' sinews from the dragon Delphynē, and more obviously when the Fates get Typhon to eat the "ephemeral fruits" (and this resembles Inara's deceptive feast). Illuyankas is a serpent; the lower quarters of Apollodoros' Typhon are composed of vipers (ἐχιδνῶν, Apollodoros 1.6.3). But one major difference between the Hittite and Greek myths is that in both versions of the Illuyankas myth, the helper is a mortal. The fate of Hupasiya and the Storm God's unnamed son are a major focus in the respective versions of the myth. Walter Burkert has argued that the fate of the Storm God's son is "reminiscent of sacrificial ideology" and therefore rooted in ritual; this element of the myth was therefore not easily transported into a different cultural context.[70] The absence of a mortal helper in the Greek versions is, then, one indication that the Illuyankas myth was not adopted wholesale into a Greek context but was adapted and transformed in the process.

The serpent presents a different sort of threat than the bridging of distinct cosmic regions that Ullikummi accomplishes simply through his prodigious size. The Illuyankas myth provides the text for the *purulli* festival, an annual ritual performed, as the opening of the myth states, both to celebrate the growing and thriving of the land, and to ensure that the land continues to grow and thrive.[71] *Purulli* has been interpreted as a spring festival ritually enacting the regeneration of life at the beginning of the year, represented in the myth by the Storm God's victory over the serpent.[72] The restoration of the Storm God ensures the productivity of the land

70. Burkert (1979) 9.
71. *CTH* 321.1-2 (see Beckman 1982:18 for translation).
72. See Gaster (1950) 317-24, Bryce (2002) 216-17.

and a rich harvest.[73] The period of the serpent's ascendancy thus corresponds to the barren season, when want potentially threatens continued civilization. In a larger sense, he represents chaotic upheavals—drought, famine, and death—that from a human perspective are a degeneration of cosmic order.[74]

My analysis has shown that in Greek sources, Typhoeus' attempt to take supremacy among the gods is linked to a larger story of Zeus' acquisition and consolidation of power. Furthermore, Typhoeus is represented as a threat to the stability of the cosmos itself. Though he is born after Zeus, and is therefore chronologically younger, he is in various ways identified as a member of a developmentally earlier generation of gods. He is either the son of the primordial parents Gaia and Tartaros, as the *Theogony* and Apollodoros have it, or he is the offspring of Kronos, as reported in the *Iliad* scholion. The *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* makes Hera the sole parent of Typhoeus, but there is still a closeness to previous generations: Hera bears Typhoeus only after Gaia, Ouranos, and the Titans dwelling in Tartaros grant her prayer for a son who will be greater than Zeus. The threat that Typhoeus presents is that of a reversal of the development of an ordered universe under Zeus and a return to an earlier, chaotic state; this danger is signified in Apollodoros by the confusion of space effected by Typhoeus' gigantic body.

In this section I have discussed two examples of a Typhoeus-like figure who challenges and even temporarily defeats the head god of the pantheon in Hittite texts. The first, the monster Ullikummi in the Kumarbi cycle, has striking parallels to the Greek examples of Typhoeus

73. Hoffner (2007) 129.
74. Cf. Bryce (2002) 216.

explored above. Ullikummi is created as a challenger to the reigning storm god Teshub by his displaced predecessor, Kumarbi. Thus Ullikummi, like Typhoeus, is a child of a god from a past generation. A more precise parallel to Typhoeus can also be found: Ullikummi's creation through Kumarbi's mating with an enormous rock corresponds to the Iliadic scholion's account of the birth of Typhoeus from an egg impregnated by Kronos. Ullikummi is Kumarbi's son as Typhoeus is Kronos' son; both are made to challenge the storm god who displaced their father. Like Apollodoros' Typhon, Ullikummi brings together the separate realms of the cosmos through his prodigious body; he reaches from the earth up to heaven.

The Typhoeus Similes

I have shown that in Hesiod and other Greek sources Typhoeus' attempt on Zeus is an organic element of the succession myth, and parallels from other cultures show that Typhoeus belongs to a tradition widely diffused through the Near East and the Aegean. With this background in mind I turn to the interpretation of the Typhoeus similes themselves, and the implications of this interpretation for an understanding of the *Iliad*. The similes, of course, do not mention the struggle over divine succession explicitly, but they do allude to it. The specific grounds of comparison in the similes are limited to physical phenomena: the speed of the army is like the speed of a vast fire; the earth's groaning caused by the Akhaian advance is like the groaning when Zeus lashes the earth with his thunderbolt. Further points of comparison or connection are left implicit. It is a basic characteristic of all similes that there cannot be perfect correspondence between the items being compared; thus, in a Homeric simile by necessity there

will be both similarities and dissimilarities between the "target domain" (the entity or idea from the main narrative) and the "source domain" (the domain of the simile).[75] But since the explicit grounds of comparison in the Typhoeus similes are limited to speed and sound, the relation of the characters in the similes is left obscure—it is unclear whether the Akhaians are being likened to Zeus, or to Typhoeus. According to Elizabeth Minchin, extended similes (those which incorporate a "brief narrative or narrative fragment") guide the audience's interpretation through the detail provided in the narrative, which allows for a more complete mapping between target and source domains than in an unelaborated simile.[76] The extended simile about Typhoeus' lashing, however, works in the opposite direction; rather than guiding the audience's interpretation, the simile leaves the relation between the target and source domains unclear, and thus opens up interpretive possibilities. This allows the poem's audience to interpret the simile based on their understanding of other parts of the poem and of the causes of the Trojan War in general. This is not simply a case of leaving interpretation open, [77]

First, the similes can be understood as likening the Akhaians to Zeus himself. The similes point to a parallel between the Akhaian army and Zeus' weapon, the thunderbolt. In the second simile, the earth groans because Zeus strikes it with his thunderbolt just as the earth groans

---

75. Given a schematized simile A IS LIKE B, A is the target domain, and B the source domain. On the incomplete overlap between target and source domains, see Minchin (2001) 29. The terminology of target and source stems from Lakoff and Turner (1989). To apply another commonly used set of terms to the simile A IS LIKE B, A is the tenor, B the vehicle; this terminology stems from Richards (1936).
76. Minchin (2001) 38-39.
77. See Heiden (1998) for a treatment of a Homeric simile (*Iliad* 24.480-84) that stresses the variety of interpretations a Homeric audience might place on a single simile.

under the Akhaians' feet. The comparison of the Akhaians to fire can be seen as part of the same parallelism: Zeus' thunderbolts cause fire to break out, the Akhaians are as swift and destructive as fire. Though this interpretation of the simile is based on the notion that the physical power of the Akhaians is like that of Zeus, it meshes with a certain ethical evaluation of the opposing sides in the Trojan War.[78] The *Iliad* makes the Trojans responsible for the conflict. Paris' abduction of Helen is a violation of *xeniē*, the guest-host relationship protected by Zeus himself, and the Trojans' refusal to return her makes them collectively responsible for Paris' crime. Menelaos claims that Zeus Xenios will destroy Troy because of *mēnis* at Paris' violation of hospitality (13.623-25). Helen's abduction occurs before the *Iliad*, but within the poem's primary fabula, Pandaros breaks the truce made for the single combat of Paris and Menelaos, for which Agamemnon claims the Trojans will ultimately be destroyed (4.270-71), a thought later echoed by Antenor (7.351-53). The Trojans' disregard for *xeniē* and breaking of oaths are transgressions against a social order which is ultimately safeguarded by Zeus. Thus one could easily map the Trojans onto Zeus' enemy, Typhoeus. On this reading, the Akhaians are surrogates of Zeus, and operate in accordance with the will of Zeus, the authorizing force for the plot of the *Iliad*; both Zeus and the Akhaians are opposed to forces of disorder.[79]

This reading of the similes does not draw upon the specific theme of succession, but rather upon Typhoeus' role as a force of disorder. The Trojans' offense is that they have

78. See Van der Valk (1964) 2:475.
79. On the *dios boulē* as the motivation for the plot of the *Iliad* (or as the plot itself), see Whitman (1958) 230-231; Nagy (1979) 77, 81-82, 98, 101, 113, 130-31, 134-35, 188, 219-20, 333-38; Edwards (1987) 138; Heiden (1996) 19-22; Murnaghan (1997); Clay (1999); Marks (2002) 12-19.

disregarded basic social obligations, and since institutions such as *xeniē* and oath-making are religiously sanctioned, the Trojans can be portrayed as offenders against the gods and deserving of divine retribution. Agamemnon invokes Zeus, Helios, the rivers, earth, and "the gods below" (οἳ ὑπένερθε, 3.278) to take vengeance on those who break the truce for Paris' and Menelaos' duel. The invocation starts with Zeus as the head of the pantheon, and then takes in powers belonging to sky, earth, and the underworld.[80] One could say that breaking an oath is to put oneself at odds with the cosmos itself. But while the Trojans are analagous to Typhoeus in this respect, this is different than attempting to displace Zeus.

A second way of seeing the similes is that they liken the Akhaians to Typhoeus.[81] Recall that in the various versions of the Typhoeus episode, fire is associated with both Zeus and Typhoeus. The fire simile thus provides equal grounds to connect the Akhaians with Zeus and with Typhoeus. A similar ambiguity arises with the imagery of the groaning earth. The earth groans during the Typhoeus episode, presumably because Typhoeus is her child, but also because of the trauma caused by the combat, which is so severe that it disturbs not only the earth but the entire cosmos. For an audience that regarded the *Kypria* as authoritative, the Trojan War was motivated by Gaia's distress under the burden of human overpopulation. Throughout Book 2, there are similes that portray the groaning or thundering of the earth under the feet of the multitudes of Akhaians (*Iliad* 2.95-96, 465-66, 781-85), a dynamic illustration of the distress that the crowd of humanity can cause for the earth. Both before and after Agamemnon's test of the

80. Burkert (1985) 250-51, Vacca (1991) 12.
81. Nimis (1987: 75) argues that the simile portrays the Akhaians' attempt to capture Troy without Akhilleus threatens his *timē*, just as Typhoeus' attack challenges Zeus' *timē*.

army, the Akhaians are portrayed as a numberless, unruly mob. The enormous noise aroused by their feet seems to spring from the same kind of chaotic energy found in Typhoeus' person, for instance in his "tireless feet" (πόδες ἀκάματοι, *Theogony* 824).[82] That the earth would groan under the Akhaians' feet may suggest that this army has the same potential to disrupt the cosmic order as Typhoeus. This is not to say that the similes imply that the Akhaians are setting out to storm heaven, or intend to challenge Zeus. Rather, the similes locate the Akhaians and the Trojan War within a larger history of the coming to be and evolution of an ordered cosmos under the rule of Zeus, and represents this as a process that is still ongoing in the primary fabula of the *Iliad*; in other words, the similes imply that the Trojan War is part of a much longer process of cosmogony. This use of the Typhoeus myth contrasts with the *Theogony*'s Typhoeus episode, where, as I argued above, Zeus' defeat of the monster is an essential step in making an end to divine succession, which clears the way for the consolidation of Zeus' power. For the *Iliad*, the consolidation of Zeus' power is not yet complete. But it is significant that the similes narrate the repeated punishment of Typhoeus after his defeat, rather than his attack upon Zeus. Typhoeus' punishment is a reminder that it is inevitable that Zeus will establish a stable rule, even if this has not yet occurred as the Akhaians march forth, and that those who resist this process may meet with no better fate than Gaia's son.

Finally, just as the similes liken the Akhaians both to Zeus and to Typhoeus, so too do they point out that Akhilleus resembles both Zeus and Typhoeus. Though he is conspicuously absent from the forces on the march, Akhilleus is nevertheless mentioned in the Catalogue of

82. See Detienne and Vernant (1974) 116-17.

Ships (2.683-94); in any case, it seems unlikely that Akhilleus would ever have been far from the minds of the audience of the *Iliad*. Like Typhoeus, Akhilleus is a figure who could have displaced Zeus as the king of gods and men, if only things had turned out differently. As a tradition first attested in Pindar and Aeschylus has it, Thetis, who was the object of rivalry between Zeus and Poseidon, was destined to bear a son greater than his father. When Zeus was made aware of this danger, he saw to it that Thetis married Peleus, ensuring that he did not produce a son to rival him.[83] While the similes may suggest an alternate history in which Akhilleus follows in Typhoeus' footsteps and challenges Zeus directly, this is a possibility that has been closed off by the circumstances of Akhilleus' birth. But Typhoeus is a paradigm for Akhilleus in a more subtle way: inasmuch as Agamemnon's authority is derived from Zeus, Akhilleus' resistance to his leadership is a disruption of the heroic social order in the same way as Typhoeus' attack disrupts the cosmic order.[84] The analogy between Akhilleus and Zeus can best be seen in the fight with the river Skamandros in Book 21.[85] This episode is an example of a combat myth, a narrative pattern widely diffused in Near Eastern and Greek mythology in which a god or hero battles a monstrous adversary, who is either serpentine in nature or associated with water or possesses these two characteristics in combination. Zeus' combat with Typhoeus is one example of a

---

83. See Pindar *Isthmian* 8.29-38, Aiskhylos *Prometheus Bound* 907-27. Slatkin (1991) demonstrates how allusions to this and other traditions about Thetis portray her marriage to Peleus as the resolution of the succession myth, and make Akhilleus' mortality the price of cosmic stability.
84. See the lineage of Agamemnon's scepter, passed down to him from Zeus, at 2.100-108, and Wilson (2002:36-37) on the scepter as "cosmological authentication" of Agamemnon's special status among the Akhaian kings.
85. I discuss the Theomachy and *Flusskampf* of Books 20 and 21 more fully in Chapter 5.

Greek combat myth; other Greek examples usually involve heroes rather than gods, such as Herakles' conflicts with the Hydra and the river Akheloios.[86] Based on this schematic account it is easy to slot Akhilleus into the role of the hero, who defends civilization against the chaos embodied by the adversary.[87] When the river fight is compared to the battle with Typhoeus, Akhilleus' role parallels that of Zeus. This, however, should not prevent the recognition that in the events leading up to the river fight and in the battle itself, Akhilleus acts in ways that threaten the social order; in other words, in his combat with Skamandros, Akhilleus not only parallels Zeus but also significantly resembles Typhoeus. The similes of Book 2 that this chapter has analyzed prepare the ground for understanding the dual role Akhilleus plays in Book 21, as both the unruly threat to civilized order, and its protector.

I will discuss Akhilleus' role in the river-fight more fully in Chapter Five, along with the Theomachy of Books 20 and 21 of which the river-fight is a part. In the following chapter, I analyze the *Iliad*'s representation of the Trojan landscape in the first pitched battle narrative of the poem, and show that the Akhaians are depicted as forces of disorder and chaos. This depiction reinforces the second of the readings of the simile pair discussed in this chapter, in which the Akhaians are aligned with Typhoeus as a threat to cosmic order.

---

86. Mondi (1990) 182-83 suggests that an original association between Typhoeus and the sea has been obscured by "a purely Greek development in which Typhon was connected with volcanic activity." For a comprehensive treatment of Greek combat myths, see Fontenrose (1959), which also has extensive discussion of Near Eastern and Indo-European material; see also Forsyth (1987), Watkins (1995), Wyatt (1998).
87. On the serpent adversary as a representation of chaos, see Watkins (1995) 299-300.

Chapter Two: The Trojan Landscape and the Overburdened Earth

Near the end of Book 4, the Akhaian and Trojan armies meet in combat for the first time. Their battle occupies the whole of Book 5 and lasts into Book 6, when the fighting is interrupted by Hektor's return to Troy. In this chapter, I will argue that this, the first extended battle narrative in the *Iliad*, represents the battle not just as a conflict between men, but as a figurative assault upon the Trojan landscape. In the section of the *Iliad* I consider in this chapter (4.422-6.35) individual Trojans are closely associated with their landscape through their biographies, genealogies, and onomastics, and both individual Trojans and the Trojan army as a whole are characterized by similes comparing them to features of the natural and pastoral world. The Akhaians are also assimilated to elements of the landscape, but unlike the Trojans they are depicted as wild, chaotic forces, for instance, wind-driven waves, rivers in flood, fire, and wild beasts such as lions and wolves. Though these forces are an integral part of nature, they threaten the human landscape with destruction and ruin.

This chapter will proceed by analyzing the landscape imagery of selected passages from the first pitched battle scene in the *Iliad* in the order they occur in the narrative. My analysis will show how the landscape is drawn into the battle, and further will reveal two ways in which the landscape imagery of this section implicates the action of the poem in a longer history of the cosmos. In the chapter's first half, through an examination of the section's opening similes, I demonstrate how associations made in this section of the *Iliad* between Greeks and the sea and

between Trojans and rivers reflect a pattern found throughout the *Iliad* in which the opposing sides are assimilated to salt and fresh water. The conflict between Greeks and Trojans reflects the strife between these two types of water found in theogonic myth that makes Okeanos and Tethys the primeval parents of all things, and parallels the antagonistic relationship in Mesopotamian myth between Apsu and Tiamat, divinities of fresh and salt water respectively.[1] The assimilation of the opposing sides to opposing waters thus elevates the struggle before the walls of Troy to an elemental conflict which stretches back to the very beginnings of things. In the chapter's second half, I deal with a long list of named but minor Trojan warriors killed by Akhaians, who by their close associations with the Trojan countryside, link the *Iliad* to the prehistory of the Trojan War. Through their deaths, these minor characters figure the Akhaian attack as a devastation of the landscape itself. This figurative combat anticipates the actual combat with the landscape that occurs in Akhilleus' battle with the river Skamandros in Book 21. Finally, as I discuss in the chapter's conclusion, in showing the landscape figuratively suffering at the hands of mortals, the poem recapitulates the cause of the Trojan War found in extra-Homeric accounts such as the *Kypria*: the weighing down of the earth by humanity.

I do not use the term "landscape" simply to denote the natural environment of a particular region, but to indicate an expanse of land shaped by human and divine activities, such as herding, agriculture, and cult practice. Landscape is thus a cultural construction. The word has two senses, of course, referring both to an actual, historic place, or to a representation of a place,

1. Fenno (2005).

especially in visual art.[2] The Trojan landscape as we find it in Homer is a landscape in the sense of representation, and while it is no doubt informed by knowledge of the topography of the ancient Troad, Homer's portrayal of Troy and its environs is not a mere reflection of a historical landscape, but, as Agathe Thornton puts it, a "poetic construction."[3] Accordingly I will have little concern here with how the *Iliad* reflects the historical topography of Troy, but instead will focus on how the representation of the landscape reflects the poem's larger thematic concerns.

While the linkage of the Achaians and the Trojans with the landscape is a recurring concern in this section of the narrative, not every figure who appears in this section has a discernable place in this line of imagery. In other words, the motif of waging war on the Troad is not systematically advanced with every duel, but it is still a prominent element and is particularly pronounced at the beginning of the general fighting and in the first Trojan deaths.

Many of the instances of landscape imagery that I analyze here have been dealt with by earlier scholars. However, these analyses tend to concentrate on individual passages, or in the case of Carroll Moulton's analysis of the similes in Book 4, on a series of similes;[4] to my knowledge, no one has attempted a comprehensive and synthetic analysis of the landscape imagery in this section of the *Iliad* as a whole. Instead the focus has been on the effects of this imagery in individual passages: for instance, how the comparison of a dying warrior to a felled

---

2. See Hirsch (1995) 7-10 and Jackson (1997) 299-306.
3. Thornton (1984) 150. For a recent attempt to demonstrate that the *Iliad*'s geography is an accurate representation of the Troad, see Luce (1998) Ch. 1-4 *passim*. Luce is mistaken in thinking that the idea that the *Iliad*'s landscape is a social construction equals the idea that it is a fabrication (9-10).
4. Moulton (1977) 42-45.

tree heightens the pathos of a particular scene, or how a series of similes develops a characterization of the Greek army. I will build on these conclusions to show how this line of imagery shapes this section of the battle and resonates with themes that are developed throughout the *Iliad*.

Opening Similes

This section of the poem (4.422-6.35), its first extended battle narrative, opens with a description of the Akhaian and Trojan armies as they march against each other. Three developed similes, mixed with narrative, dominate this section. One simile describes each army, and a third simile describes both armies as they finally meet in combat, giving a general picture of the fighting before the narrative moves to individual duels. A close reading of each of these similes as it occurs provides my focus in the first half of this chapter.

The Greeks and the Trojans here resume the march towards battle that began in Book 2 but was interrupted for the duel of Menelaos and Paris. Some of the imagery used in Book 2 and in the passage describing the resumption of battle in Book 4 is similar. The gleam of the warriors' arms (2.455-58, 4.431-32) and Athene's exhortation of the army (2.446-54, 4.439-45) appear both in the introduction to the Catalogue of Ships and in Book 4. The latter passage expands on the motif of divine exhortation by having Ares urge the Trojans forward along with his companions Terror, Rout, and Strife (4.439-40). But in other respects the descriptions of the armies in Book 4 differ from those in Book 2, and are less elaborate. Whereas a grand series of seven similes characterize the Akhaian army and their commander Agamemnon in Book 2, in

Book 4 the fighting is introduced with only three similes, those I turn to now. As we shall see, each simile appeals signficantly to features of the landscape to describe human armies.

The Greeks and the Sea

In this section, I argue that the *Iliad*'s water imagery figures the conflict at Troy as an elemental battle between salt and fresh water, and also aligns the Akhaians with an element that appears in Near Eastern and Greek mythology as a threat either to human civilization or to the cosmic order. In isolation, the simile comparing the Akhaians to waves of the sea (4.422-28, which is the first of the three similes introducing the battle narrative in Book 4, may seem trivial, but as one instance within a larger network of imagery, it takes on greater significance. Its position as the opening member of a frame for the first pitched battle in the *Iliad* gives it further importance. As the Akhaian force advances, their seemingly infinite number is compared to the waves of the sea (4.422-28):

> ὡς δ᾽ ὅτ᾽ ἐν αἰγιαλῷ πολυηχέϊ κῦμα θαλάσσης
> ὄρνυτ᾽ ἐπασσύτερον Ζεφύρου ὕπο κινήσαντος·
> πόντῳ μέν τε πρῶτα κορύσσεται, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
> χέρσῳ ῥηγνύμενον μεγάλα βρέμει, ἀμφὶ δέ τ᾽ ἄκρας
> κυρτὸν ἐὸν κορυφοῦται, ἀποπτύει δ᾽ ἁλὸς ἄχνην·
> ὣς τότ᾽ ἐπασσύτεραι Δαναῶν κίνυντο φάλαγγες
> νωλεμέως πόλεμον δέ...
>
> and as when the wave of the sea beats again and again
> on a resounding beach under the driving West Wind:
> and it first is gathered on the sea, but then
> breaking on the land thunders greatly, and about the headlands
> its arched crest breaks, and it spews salty foam:
> so then the phalanxes of the Danaans drove forth in succession
> unceasingly to battle...

The echo of ἐπασσύτερον (423)... ἐπασσύτεραι (427) emphasizes the limitless number of waves and the seemingly limitless ranks of the Achaians while putting forward an image of immense force and power. The wind, noise (βρέμει, 425), and spray (426) associated with the waves show that these are large, storm-driven waves that strike the shore violently. Whereas the wave is driven by the west wind (κινήσαντος, 422), the Greeks are self-driving (κίνυντο, 427), and are thus both the wind and the wave. In assimilating the Akhaians to potentially destructive natural forces this simile recalls the fire similes before and after the Catalogue of Ships (2.455-58, 2.780), as well as two similes earlier in Book 2 that compare the noise of the Greeks to the roaring waves of the sea. In the first, the Akhaians return to assembly after their rush to the ships (2.207-10):

> ...οἳ δ' ἀγορήνδε
> αὖτις ἐπεσσεύοντο νεῶν ἄπο καὶ κλισιάων
> ἠχῇ, ὡς ὅτε κῦμα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης
> αἰγιαλῷ μεγάλῳ βρέμεται, σμαραγεῖ δέ τε πόντος.
>
> and they again
> rushed to assembly from their ships and huts
> with a noise as when a wave of the loud-roaring sea
> crashes on a great beach, and the deep sea thunders.

Later, the army approves a speech of Agamemnon with a roar (2.394-97):

> Ὣς ἔφατ', Ἀργεῖοι δὲ μέγ' ἴαχον ὡς ὅτε κῦμα
> ἀκτῇ ἐφ' ὑψηλῇ, ὅτε κινήσῃ Νότος ἐλθών,
> προβλῆτι σκοπέλῳ· τὸν δ' οὔ ποτε κύματα λείπει
> παντοίων ἀνέμων, ὅτ' ἂν ἔνθ' ἢ ἔνθα γένωνται.
>
> So he spoke, and the Argives shouted loudly, like a wave
> upon a lofty headland, when the South wind comes and drives it
> on a jutting promontory, which the waves never leave
> in any sort of wind, whether coming from this side or that.

In a 2005 article, Jonathan Fenno observes that these similes are part of a larger pattern of imagery found throughout the *Iliad* associating the Greeks with the sea, and moreover that this pattern is complemented by an association of Trojans with rivers.[5] The opposition between Akhaians and Trojans thus echoes an elemental antagonism between salt and fresh water. Fenno also finds this opposition among the divine supporters of each side—Poseidon supports the Akhaians, and in Book 21 the river Skamandros fights on behalf of the Trojans. Another manifestation of conflict between salt and sweet water is the unending marital squabbles of the primeval couple Okeanos and Tethys, respectively a world-encircling river who is the source of all fresh waters and the salty sea. Fenno has convincingly demonstrated this pattern of aqueous antipathy extending throughout the *Iliad*, but he has not fully explained the role played by the sea. In fact, in the *Iliad*, deities associated with the sea are sources of conflict among the gods. Elsewhere in Greek myth, the sea produces monsters who threaten human civilization. These Greek concepts draw upon an understanding of the sea widespread in Near Eastern sources as a force of chaos that threatens an ordered universe. Building upon Fenno's observation of this pattern of opposition, and my and other scholars' analysis of the negative value placed on the sea in Greek and Near Eastern sources, I will argue that the Akhaians' figurative assimilation to salt water links them with chaos and so characterizes the Akhaians themselves as forces of disorder.

In the *Iliad*, two gods of the sea, Poseidon and Tethys, are involved in conflict among the gods. Poseidon is of course one of the more prominent divine supporters of the Akhaians, which opposes him to Zeus, who is sympathetic towards the Trojans. When Zeus turns his attention

5. Fenno (2005).

away from the battlefield at the beginning of Book 13, Poseidon journeys to Troy and helps the Greeks turn back a Trojan assault that was on the verge of burning the Akhaian ships. Poseidon's intervention, along with that of Hera in Book 14, disrupts Zeus' stated plan to make the Trojans temporarily victorious in order to bring honor to Akhilleus; for a time, at least, Poseidon succeeds in throwing Zeus' designs off course. There are hints that Poseidon's opposition to Zeus concerns more than the immediate matter of the Trojan War, but also the distribution of power among the gods. In Book 15, when Zeus sends his messenger Iris to order Poseidon from the battlefield, the sea god objects that Zeus has spoken presumptuously (ὑπέρπολον, 15.185) to one who has equal honor with him (ὁμότιμον ἐόντα, 15.186). Poseidon gives two reasons for his claim of equal honor: first, he, Zeus, and their brother Hades are all sons of Kronos and Rhea. Moreover, each brother has been allotted an equal division of the cosmos: Poseidon has the sea, Hades the underworld, and Zeus the heavens, with earth and Olympos being common to all (15.187-93). Poseidon denies that Zeus has a special claim to authority based on birth order or upon the cosmic realm allotted to him. The sea god instead asserts that all three brothers are, or at least should be, equals. Poseidon says that Zeus should remain within his third share (μενέτω τριτάτη ἐνὶ μοίρῃ, 15. 195) and direct his threats at his children, who must listen to him. In response, Iris urges Poseidon to reconsider, saying that the minds of the noble may be turned (στρεπταὶ μέν τε φρένες ἐσθλῶν, 15.203). She adds a second point, that the Erinyes always attend the elder born (πρεσβυτέροισιν Ἐρινύες αἰὲν ἕπονται, 15.204), implying that open conflict between the two brothers will not end in Poseidon's favor. Zeus' priority in birth has been mentioned in an earlier passage describing the brothers' opposed wills (13.345-60); since Zeus

is the elder born and knows more (πλείονα ἴδη, 13.355), Poseidon must defy him covertly, disguising himself as a man. The poem's references to Zeus' priority in birth may presuppose a story in which he is simply the eldest son, but there may be an allusion to an account such as that found in Hesiod's *Theogony*, in which Zeus starts out as the youngest child of Kronos and Rhea, but becomes the eldest after his siblings are swallowed by Kronos and then reborn as he vomits them out. References to Zeus' primogeniture would thus mask a more complicated background that does not neatly support a claim to natural authority through his status as eldest child.[6] In his response to Iris, Poseidon leaves the issue of birth priority untouched. The sea god continues to protest against his mistreatment: he has *akhos* ("grief") because Zeus has threatened "one of equal portion and one who has been allotted an equal share" (ἰσόμορον καὶ ὁμῇ πεπρωμένον αἴσῃ, 15.209).[7] Though Poseidon is justifiably indignant (νεμεσσηθείς, 15.211) nevertheless he will give way and withdraw from battle. He holds forth the possibility of future discord, however: if Zeus prevents the fall of Troy, "incurable bile" (ἀνήκεστος χόλος, 15.217) will arise between the two brothers. Even in yielding, Poseidon asserts that he is Zeus' equal, and so disputes the legitimacy of Zeus' authority over his siblings. Moreover, the sea god both affirms his present anger towards Zeus and the possibility of future discord.

Another deity of the sea who is involved in divine conflict is Tethys. In the episode known as the *Dios Apatē* ("Deception of Zeus") in Book 14, Hera claims she will journey to the edges of the earth to settle the "unceasing quarrels" of Okeanos and Tethys (ἄκριτα νείκεα,

6. See Friedman (2001) 105, Heiden (2008) 172-73.
7. On *akhos* as grief caused by a loss of *timē*, see Cook (2003).

14.205=304), who no longer share a marriage bed because they have *kholos* towards each other (14.206-207=305-306). Hera's words are a pretext, but one that recognizably adapts theogonic myth in which Okeanos and Tethys are the sources of all things, rather than Gaia and Ouranos as in Hesiod's *Theogony*. In fact, Hera calls Okeanos and Tethys the parents of the gods (14.201=302). Okeanos is known from the earliest Greek sources as a freshwater god: he is a world-encircling river and the source of all other rivers and springs (21.195-97, *Theogony* 337-70). Tethys is regularly identified with the salty sea in Hellenistic and Latin literature, and this identification underlies the *Iliad* passage as well.

Negative portraits of the sea can be found in Greek myth outside the *Iliad*.[8] The sea is often a home of monsters, as seen in the monstrous children of Pontos through Phorkys and Keto catalogued in Hesiod's *Theogony* (*Theogony* 270-336). In heroic mythology, sea monsters are a common opponent; rather than being a direct threat to cosmic order, these monsters are a threat to human civilization. Herakles' combat with a sea monster sent by Poseidon to ravage the lands of Troy is mentioned several times in the *Iliad* (7.451-453, 20.145-148, 21.442-45).

These Greek ideas of the sea parallel an understanding of the sea as a chaotic force widely diffused in Near Eastern myth. This similarity is generally understood to be the result of Near Eastern influence upon Greece. A particularly clear instance of borrowing is found in the couple Okeanos and Tethys, who are remarkably similar to the couple Apsu and Tiamat in the Babylonian poem *Enuma Elish*.[9] Tethys' very name may be a borrowing from the Near East, as it

8. See Mondi (1990) 181-82.
9. The parallel was first pointed out by the English Prime Minister William Gladstone (1890: 129-32). See also Lesky (1947) 64-66, 80-85; Janko (1992) on *Iliad* 14.200-207; Burkert (1992)

quite possibly derives from Tiamat's name. In Akkadian, Tiamat's name is simply the word for sea, found in the forms *tiāmtu*, *tâmtu*, and *têmtu*; the latter two forms could have been brought into Greek as *tēthu-*.[10]

At the beginning of *Enuma Elish*, Apsu and Tiamat "were mixing their waters together"; Apsu is an underground freshwater ocean who is the sources of all rivers and springs, and Tiamat is the salty sea.[11] The couple produces children, who remain inside Tiamat; when Apsu, disturbed by the commotion of his offspring, plots to destroy them, he and Tiamat quarrel. The younger god Ea, himself a deity of fresh water, learns of Apsu's plan and attacks and defeats him. Ea then constructs a temple and dwelling for himself upon Apsu's body. The discord between Apsu and Tiamat and the physical separation of the couple caused by Ea's defeat of Apsu finds a humorous parallel in the endless marital squabbles of Okeanos and Tethys in the *Iliad*; the Greek couple is physically separate as well, since they refuse to share a marriage bed.[12] Ea's triumph over Apsu is merely a prelude for the central episode of *Enuma Elish*, the combat of Ea's son Marduk with Tiamat. The combat is spurred when Tiamat, irritated by the vigorous activity of Marduk and desiring revenge for the defeat of Apsu, gives birth to a host of monsters in preparation for war against the other gods, and gives her consort Qingu the Tablet of Destinies, which entitles its possessor to divine kingship. The defeat of Tiamat both enables Marduk to form the heavens and the earth from her body and to claim kingship for himself. In other words, the defeat of the

---

91-93; West (1997) 144-48, 382-85; and Fenno (2005) 494-96.
10. Szermerényi (1974) 150, Burkert (1992) 92-93, West (1997) 147. Wyatt (2003: 216-20) examines possible Semitic etymologies for Okeanos.
11. *Enuma Elish* 1.1-5 (ANET 60-61).
12. Burkert (1992) 92, West (1997) 383.

rebellious sea leads to the establishment of an ordered cosmos, which here involves both the creation of the physical universe and also the stabilization of its political structure.

Baal's combat with Yam, known from 14th century BCE poetic texts found at the ancient city of Ugarit in Syria, provides a second Near Eastern example of the sea as an enemy of the order of things.[13] Yam is the sea personified, and his name, like Tiamat's, is simply a word for sea. By overcoming Yam, the storm god Baal establishes his kingship over the gods. This battle has nothing to do with the creation of the physical universe, and in this respect is unlike the Marduk-Tiamat conflict, but the Ugaritic text resembles *Enuma Elish* in making the subjugation of the sea a precondition for establishing the political order of the cosmos.[14]

Divine combat with the sea also underlies several passages in the Hebrew Bible, and this is generally thought to reflect the influence of Canaanite mythology.[15] The separation of land from sea that occurs in the creation of the world can be portrayed in terms of a battle (Ps. 104.5-9):[16]

> You set the earth on its foundations,
> that it shall never be shaken.
> You cover it with the deep as with a garment;
> the waters stood above the mountains.
> At your rebuke they flee;
> at the sound of your thunder they take to flight.
> They rose up to the mountains, ran down to the valleys
> to the place you appointed for them.

---

13. The Baal-Yam myth occupies two fragmentary tablets (*KTU* 1.1-1.2); for text and translation, see Smith (1994).
14. Cross (1973: 120) argues that the Baal-Yam combat is cosmogonic, because it deals with "the emergence of kingship among the gods." See also Grønbaek (1984).
15. See Day (1985).
16. On this passage see Day (1985) 28-35, Forsyth (1987) 55-58.

You set a boundary that they may not pass,
so that they might not again cover the earth.

Here the waters are not represented as a deity, but they still have a certain character; they are hostile to Yahweh, and must be rebuked and tamed. The limiting of the sea is central to Yahweh's creation of the world and to the establishment of proper boundaries between its constituents. Without such boundaries, the waters would once again cover the land, returning the cosmos to an undifferentiated, disordered state.

Like the Typhoeus similes I discussed in Chapter One, the simile at 4.422-28 characterizes the Akhaian army as a whole at a high point in the narrative—and just as the Typhoeus similes, in one reading, present the Akhaians as being similar to Typhoeus in their potential to disrupt the cosmic order, so too does this simile present the Akhaians as potential disrupters of cosmos. Juxtaposing this simile with consideration of the role played by salt water in Near Eastern myth shows that by comparing the Akhaian forces to the storm-driven waves of the sea, the Homeric lines suggest that the numberless Akhaian warriors threaten destruction not only to the Trojan army and the Trojan plain, but to the settled order of the universe.

The Pastoral Trojans

The second of the three similes introducing battle in Book 4 describes the Trojan army. It does not introduce the idea that the Trojans are equivalent to fresh water directly, but it does associate them with pastoralism that takes place inland, away from the sea's edge. In sharp contrast to the image of roaring, storm-tossed waves that was applied to the Akhaians, this simile compares the Trojans to ewes confined to a sheep-fold (4.433-38):

Τρῶες δ', ὥς τ' ὄϊες πολυπάμονος ἀνδρὸς ἐν αὐλῇ
μυρίαι ἑστήκασιν ἀμελγόμεναι γάλα λευκὸν
ἀζηχὲς μεμακυῖαι ἀκούουσαι ὄπα ἀρνῶν,
ὣς Τρώων ἀλαλητὸς ἀνὰ στρατὸν εὐρὺν ὀρώρει·
οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἦεν ὁμὸς θρόος οὐδ' ἴα γῆρυς,
ἀλλὰ γλῶσσα μέμικτο, πολύκλητοι δ' ἔσαν ἄνδρες.

But the Trojans, just as the ewes of a man of much substance stand in the fold
in their multitudes being milked of white milk
bleating ceaselessly as they hear the voices of their lambs,
so the shout of the Trojans arose through the wide army;
for there was not the same speech for all nor one language,
but their tongues were mixed, and they were men called from many lands.

The comparison to sheep develops easily from the description in the preceding lines of the Akhaian troops, who are silent as their leaders give them commands. Two different words for commanders are used in that description, *hēgemonōn* (4.429) and *sēmantorās* (4.431), the last coming just before the simile for the Trojans starts. The idea of leaders is still fresh, and while the phrase is not used here, the phrase ποιμένα λαῶν, "shepherd of the host," often describes the leader of a contingent.[17] The main point of this simile is to contrast the loquacity of the Trojans and their polyglot allies with the Greeks' silence, but the image of the Trojans as ewes inevitably conveys the idea that they are helpless. In other similes, sheep are commonly depicted as prey, incapable of resisting predators like lions and wolves.[18] The feminine gender of the ewes adds to the impression of the Trojans' weakness. The bleating of the sheep, compared to the thundering of the waves in the simile that describes the Akhaians, suggests that the Trojans are lesser opponents, and the fact that the ewes are the subjects of a deliberate practice of animal

17. e.g. 1.263, 2.243, 4.296, 5.144, 6.214, etc.
18. e.g. 5.136-43, 5.554-60, 10.485-86, 15.323-25, 16.352-55.

husbandry—they are separated from their lambs for milking—heightens their contrast to the simile describing the Akhaian army as a natural, untamable force.

This simile is one of a series of images that associate the Trojans with pastoral life. In some of the individual battle scenes that form the first major episode of combat, several Trojans are said to be shepherds or related to shepherds, denoting now actual pastoralists, not military leaders. In the killings of these men who are associated with the countryside we witness a symbolic murder of that pastoral landscape.

The Armies Flow Together

Just before the narrative moves to individual battles, a third simile compares both armies to elements of the natural world. The armies have actually met and general combat has begun, as the earth was flowing with blood (ῥέε δ' αἵματι γαῖα, 4.451). The armies join like two rivers flowing together (4.452-56):

> ὡς δ' ὅτε χείμαρροι ποταμοὶ κατ' ὄρεσφι ῥέοντες
> ἐς μισγάγκειαν συμβάλλετον ὄβριμον ὕδωρ
> κρουνῶν ἐκ μεγάλων κοίλης ἔντοσθε χαράδρης,
> τῶν δέ τε τηλόσε δοῦπον ἐν οὔρεσιν ἔκλυε ποιμήν·
> ὣς τῶν μισγομένων γένετο ἰαχή τε πόνος τε.
>
> As when winter streams flowing down from the mountains
> from their great sources throw their mighty floods together
> in a meeting of the waters within a deep ravine,
> and from far off in the mountains a shepherd hears their noise;
> so arose the shout and toil of the men joining in battle.

Unlike the earlier set of similes describing each army separately, now both armies are compared to flooding rivers flowing together. The noise of their confluence recalls the crashing of the sea in the earlier simile describing the Akhaian army, but now both sides are assimilated to turbulent,

crashing water. This partially erases the distinction between the Akhaians and the Trojans made by the earlier contrast of the waves of the sea and sheep waiting to be milked. At the same time, the inclusion within the simile of a shepherd, who is far removed from the crashing confluence of waters, recalls the bleating flock of the Trojans in the lines above (4.433-38).[19] Like the shepherd in the simile, the Trojans are out of place in this battle.

Nothing in this simile refers explicitly to the topography of the Troad. The confluence of two rivers, the Simoeis and the Skamandros, is a famous feature of the Trojan plain, and this may well have suggested the image. At the same time, the rivers of the simile meet in a mountain ravine, rather than on a fertile plain. While no precise location is specified, a ravine where flooding rivers meet would well suit Ida, which the *Iliad* describes as *polupidax* ("having many springs").[20] Thus, though it does not locate the confluence of the rivers in a specific place, the simile evokes the features of the Troad.

In likening both armies to rivers flowing together, this simile deviates from the association of Greeks with the sea found in previous similes. According to Jonathan Fenno, the choice of river imagery here is motivated by the battle's distance from the sea. In general, Fenno argues, the *Iliad*'s water imagery is not rigidly allegorical, but rather "invoke[s] the setting in such a way as to draw the waterscape into the action."[21] This simile brings rivers into the battle as

19. τηλόσε (literally, "to afar") means that the shepherd's hearing is being projected to the sound, rather than the sound coming to him. Scholion bT on 4.455 reads τηλόσι, "from afar."
20. See 8.47, 14.157, 14.283, 14.307, 15.151, 20.59, 20.218, 23.117.
21. Fenno (2005) 488.

figurative combatants, anticipating the river Skamandros' entry into the battle as an actual combatant in Book 21.

The three similes that introduce the extended battle narrative in Book 4 appeal implicitly to Near Eastern traditions in which salt water combats fresh and the chaotic force of the sea overwhelms established boundaries. Comparison of the Homeric similes to their Near Eastern parallels suggests that Akhaians should be understood both as the rambunctious overburden of humanity that strains the resources of the earth and requires alleviation, and also as the flood that the sky god unleashes to resolve this problem by washing excess population from the earth. Threatened by the onrush of the Akhaian host, the Trojans, who are likened to penned up sheep, are clearly overmatched. The third simile, which likens both sides to rivers in flood, suggests that the clash of the Akhaians and Trojans is, in an important sense, a natural disaster.

What's in a Name: the Trojan Casualties (4.457-6.35)

After the three similes that introduce the Akhaian and Trojan armies collectively, the narrative moves to accounts of individual combat. In this half of the chapter, I turn to an examination of how these single or paired deaths underscore the message implied by the introductory similes examined above, that is, how the Akhaian warriors act, both individually and corporately, as an unstoppable force of destruction that threatens not only the lives of the Trojans who inhabit the landscape of the Troad, but the geographic integrity of the Troad itself. Like a flood that washes away boundaries and landmarks and renders a familiar topography unrecognizable, the Akhaians, and in particular Diomedes, symbolically lay waste to the Trojan landscape by killing a series of minor characters whose names and biographies signal their

connection to the landscape of the Troad and its gods. My argument in this section is cumulative. I will analyze each of the fallen Trojans in the order in which he appears. I pay special attention to the exploits of Diomedes, whose *aristeia* is announced by a simile comparing him to a river in flood (5.84-94). As an individual, Diomedes embodies the same natural destructive power that characterizes the Akhaian host as a whole. I conclude by considering a pair of Trojans killed near the beginning of Book 6 (21-28) by the Akhaian warrior Euryalos. The connections of his victims Aisepos and Pedasos with Troy's rivers show again how the natural features of a landscape that nourishes crops, herds, and people may be overwhelmed and destroyed by violence that is itself figured as a natural force.

Ekhepolos (4.457-72)

Ekhepolos is the first man to die in a battlefield duel in the *Iliad*. His name makes him into a representation of the Troad's nurturing capacity, specifically its capacity to nurture young men. Even though he is the first to die in this battle, he is not given an elaborate description but is merely said to be "a good man among the front ranks, Ekhepolos, son of Thalysios" (ἐσθλὸν ἐνὶ προμάχοισι Θαλυσιάδην Ἐχέπωλον, 4.458). This warrior's name, meaning "holding young horses," could indicate his personal possession of horses, as seems to be the case with Ekhepolos of Sikyon, who avoided coming to Troy by giving Menelaos a fine horse in his place (23.296-99).[22] It would be an appropriate epithet for a fertile plain, similar to the expression "horse-pasturing

22. In connection with horses, the verb *exō* usually means "drive" (8.139, 11.760, etc.), so Echepolos could also mean "driver of horses." See von Kamptz (1982) 62. The combination of *exō* + *hippos* always seems to refer to driving horses in the *Iliad*.

Argos" (e.g., 2.287). A similar epithet is *eupōlos*, twice applied to Ilion (5.551, 16.676). In addition to "colts," the word *pōlos* is used to refer to young men, so Ekhepolos' name also refers to the capacity of a territory to nurture young men.[23] Ekhepolos' patronymic, Thalusiades, is derived from *thalusia*, "firstfruits," which brings the productive ability of the landscape into focus, and likens Ekhepolos to one of the products of the earth.[24] It is intriguing that this is the patronymic of the first named man to be killed in combat in the primary fabula of the *Iliad*; it is as if he is an initial offering for what is to come.

Simoeisios (4.473-89)

After Ekhepolos, Simoeisios is the next Trojan to die. His name gives him a clear tie to the Simoeis, the second most important river of the Trojan plain after the Skamandros. Simoeisios is an embodiment of the river's role in sustaining plant life, the herd animals that graze upon this lush vegetation, and the pastoralists who frequented the river's banks before the war. His death shows the vulnerability of this landscape to the destructive force of the Akhaians and the inability of one of Troy's tutelary rivers to protect its people. Simoeisios' biography gives him strong links with the river and its surroundings (4.473-77):[25]

---

23. s.v. LSJ, *pōlos*. There are no Homeric uses of *pōlos* to mean young man, but I doubt that the sense was unfamiliar to Homeric audiences.
24. Von Kamptz (1982: 116) derives this name from the month of Thalusia, but the name of the month would be derived from the offering of first-fruits at the festival which gives this month its name; whatever the exact etymology, the connection with the harvest offering remains.
25. For other treatments of the Simoeisios passage see Moulton (1977) 56-58, Schein (1984) 73-76, and Scully (1990) 11. Schein in particular has much in common with my argument; he sees Simoesios as a landscape symbol who presages the fall of Troy, but is more interested in what this passage reveals about Homer's attitude towards death.

ἔνθ᾽ ἔβαλ᾽ Ἀνθεμίωνος υἱὸν Τελαμώνιος Αἴας
ἠΐθεον θαλερὸν Σιμοείσιον, ὅν ποτε μήτηρ
Ἴδηθεν κατιοῦσα παρ᾽ ὄχθῃσιν Σιμόεντος
γείνατ᾽, ἐπεί ῥα τοκεῦσιν ἅμ᾽ ἕσπετο μῆλα ἰδέσθαι·
τοὔνεκά μιν κάλεον Σιμοείσιον·

Then Aias the son of Telamon struck the son of Anthemion,
an unmarried, blooming youth, Simoeisios, whom once his mother bore
beside the banks of the Simoeis when she came down from Ida,
following her parents to watch their flocks.
Because of this they called him Simoeisios.

This biography draws attention to the origin of Simoesios' name, which comes from his birth on the banks of the river, where his unnamed mother had come along with her parents to watch their flocks. The pastoral images of the preceding similes have not been associated with a specific geography, but now the biography of Simoeisios evokes pastoral imagery in a way that that specifically anchors it in the topography of the Troad: Simoeisios' mother comes down from Ida (Ἴδηθεν κατιοῦσα, 4.475) down to the banks of the Simoeis.

Simoesios is described as ἠΐθεον and θαλερὸν, "unmarried" and "blooming," both common adjectives for young men in the *Iliad*. The latter employs a botanical metaphor found in another common description of youths: they have "the bloom of youth" (ἥβης ἄνθος, e.g. 13.484). This metaphor is carried further by the name of Simoeisios' father, Anthemion, which is derived from *anthemon*, "flower," and is also related to the epithet *anthemoeis* applied to the meadow of Skamandros at 2.467.[26] In the context of Simoeisios' biography, Anthemion's name suggests that he is a representation of the flowery meadow of the Simoeis, and that Simoeisios is a young shoot produced from the battlefield on which he is cut down.

26. See Kirk on 4.473, Von Kamptz (1982) 279.

Simoesios' likeness to a plant is further elaborated by the simile that describes his death (4.482-88):

> ... ὃ δ' ἐν κονίῃσι χαμαὶ πέσεν αἴγειρος ὣς
> ἥ ῥά τ' ἐν εἰαμενῇ ἕλεος μεγάλοιο πεφύκει
> λείη, ἀτάρ τέ οἱ ὄζοι ἐπ' ἀκροτάτῃ πεφύασι·
> τὴν μέν θ' ἁρματοπηγὸς ἀνὴρ αἴθωνι σιδήρῳ
> ἐξέταμ', ὄφρα ἴτυν κάμψῃ περικαλλέϊ δίφρῳ·
> ἣ μέν τ' ἀζομένη κεῖται ποταμοῖο παρ' ὄχθας.
>
> and he fell to the ground in the dust like a poplar
> that had grown up in the lowland of a great marsh,
> smooth, but branches grow from its top;
> a chariot-maker cut it down with shining bronze,
> to make a wheel-rim for a beautiful chariot,
> and it lies drying by the banks of the river.

Comparisons of a fallen warrior to a fallen tree are not uncommon (5.560, 14.414, 16.482, 17.53),[27] but the language of this simile is firmly grounded in the botanical imagery of Simoesios' biography. The species of the tree provides one link: αἴγειρος is the black poplar (*populus nigra*), a species found in floodplains, river valleys, and other well-watered spots.[28] In Greek literature the black poplar is regularly associated with wet places,[29] and Theophrastus names it among trees that "love wet and marshy ground."[30] The fertile marshland (ἕλεος, 4.483) named in the simile is just such a spot. This marsh is not given a specific location, but an association with the Simoeis would not be hard to make. Other occurrences of ἕλος in the *Iliad* (15.631, 20.221) refer to rich grazing lands; the banks of the Simoeis, where Simoesios' grandparents grazed their flocks, could

27. Moulton (1977) 23n8, citing Krischer (1971) 72-75.
28. On the habitat of the *populus nigra*, see Cooper (2006) 9-12.
29. e.g. *Odyssey* 5.64, 9.141, 17.208; Euripides *Hippolytus* 210-11.
30. Theophrastus *Historia Plantarum* 4.1.1 (τὰ μὲν γὰρ φιλεῖ τοὺς ἐφύδρους καὶ ἑλώδεις, οἷον αἴγειρος...).

certainly be called a ἕλος. Moreover, the poplar's location in fertile land by a river recalls the flowery river meadow that provides the name of Simoesios' father Anthemion. The tree and Simoesios begin their lives on the same sort of terrain, and they end their lives there. The felled poplar lies drying beside the banks of the river (ἥ μέν τ' ἀζομένη κεῖται ποταμοῖο παρ' ὄχθας, 4.488), which reminds us of Simoesios' birth by the river, and gives us a pathetic glimpse of his corpse lying on the earth near the river that gives him his name. The battlefield, of course, may not be directly upon the banks of the Simoeis, but it is certainly in the general vicinity; later on in this day's battle, the fighting is placed "between the Simoeis and the streams of Xanthos" (μεσσηγὺς Σιμόεντος ἰδὲ Ξάνθοιο ῥοάων, 6.4).[31]

Bernard Fenik has noted that details of Simoeisios' biography, such as the emphasis on his mother, his place of birth, and the identity of his father, are similar to details found in the biographies of several other minor characters in the *Iliad*.[32] Fenik argues that these characters are created from a common pattern, in much the same way as Homeric battle scenes follow stereotyped patterns and contain repeated details. Since Fenik's interest is in typical details, that is, features that are repeated at least twice, he does not focus on the names of these minor characters. In general, the names of these characters are unique to one person, but in many cases the names are derived from a local toponym, as with Simoeisios. In other words, the names

31. The catalogue of the rivers that destroy the Akhaian wall also implies that the battlefield is by the Simoeis, which is said to be "where many ox-hide shields and helmets fell in the dust, and the race of half-divine men" (ὅθι πολλὰ βοάγρια καὶ τρυφάλειαι / κάππεσον ἐν κονίῃσι καὶ ἡμιθέων γένος ἀνδρῶν, 12.22-23).
32. Fenik (1968) 150-52. The other examples Fenik gives are Iphiton (13.381-86), Satnios (14.442-45), and the brothers Aisepos and Pedasos (6.21-26). I will discuss Aisepos and Pedasos below.

themselves are not typical, but their derivation is. The typicality of these characters should not be taken as an indication of triviality or meaninglessness. Fenik argues that the biography of Simoeisios and similar characters are crafted to arouse pathos; the mention of the character's mother and birthplace helps create a portrait of a youth killed just before the prime of life and arouses the audience's sympathy.[33] These details also tie these characters to a particular place. Simoeisios' mother is mortal, but other characters of this type are the sons of nymphs. These divinities are often associated with specific features of the landscape, and frequently personify bodies of water such as springs. Nymphs often appear as the earliest ancestor in mythical genealogies, providing a basis for claims of autochthony and ownership of a territory.[34] As an embodiment of the flowery meadow of the Simoeis, Anthemion provides Simoeisios with a similar link to the land. The names of characters like Simoeisios, and indeed any of the minor Trojan characters who bear names derived from the toponyms of their homeland, are another way in which they are given a unique history and connection to the landscape. In the case of characters born from nymphs, their names add to the impression that they are representations of the landscape.

Through his name, his biography, and through the vegetal imagery that describes him, Simoeisios is closely linked with the riverside locale where he was born and to the river that gives this place the ability to sustain life. The account of Simoeisios' birth places the pastoral imagery mentioned in previous similes in a specific setting within the geography of Troy, and the account

33. Fenik (1968) 151.
34. Larson (2001) 5-6.

of his killing shows that setting transformed from a place that nourishes herds into a place of death. This contrast reminds the audience of the human cost of the war, which has not only killed men, but also eliminated peacetime activity from the landscape; flocks no longer graze by the banks of the Simoeis. At the same time, the transformation of this riverside setting suggests that the war is destroying the countryside of Troy itself. Earlier imagery has made water a figurative combatant, but without reference to a specific topography; now, the imagery of watery combat is placed within the Trojan landscape. Simoeisios' assimilation to his birthplace makes him a symbol of this place and its river; his death thus anticipates the river Skamandros' entry into battle in Book 21 and his defeat at the hands of Hephaistos. In that battle, Skamandros implores the Simoeis to come to his aid (21.308-15), but the Simoeis does not respond, as if his ability to resist the Akhaians has already been taken away.

Phegaios and Idaios (5.9-29)

After the death of Simoeisios the pace of the narrative quickens, and the men who are killed receive less elaborate descriptions. After Athene sheds *menos* and *tharsos* on Diomedes, initiating his *aristeia* (5.1-8), the narrative returns to a slower cadence, and the descriptions of each encounter become more detailed. The first victims of Diomedes' *aristeia* are the brothers Phegaios and Idaios (5.9-29). This pair is intimately linked with Troy's sacred landscape, and together they embody the Trojans' closeness to Zeus. One brother dies and the other survives only because of divine intervention; their fates suggest that the Akhaian assault on Troy is sacrilegious. Phegaios is killed by Diomedes, but Hephaistos saves Idaios so that his father, Dares, will not be left without a son. Hephaistos does this favor because Dares is his priest; the

names of Dares' sons, however, associate them with Zeus. Phegaios' name derives from *phegos*, the oak tree, which is sacred to Zeus (5.693, 7.58).[35] A particular oak tree, which stands near the Skaian gate (6.237, 9.354, 11.170, 21.549), is one of the few landmarks on the Trojan battlefield, and Phegaios' name gives him a relation to this particular tree.[36]

Idaios' name, of course, derives from Mt. Ida. In addition to Dares' son, a Trojan herald is named Idaios (3.248, etc.). It is not surprising to find more than one Trojan named Idaios, since the mountain has a rich vein of connections with Troy and its people. In a sense, the Trojans are from Ida, as Dardanos, a son of Zeus, founded Dardania on the slopes of Ida before the founding of Troy (20.215-19). While the ruling line of the Trojans, descended from Tros' elder son Ilos, lives in the city of Ilios on the Trojan plain, many of the descendants of Dardanos do not live in the city but rather in towns scattered around the foothills of Ida. The Dardanians are named as a separate contingent in the Trojan Catalogue of Book 2 (2.819-23); these are apparently men from the slopes of Ida where Dardanos made his settlement.[37] Their leader is Aineias, who is from a junior branch of the Trojan royal family descended from Assarakos, the younger son of Tros

---

35. Von Kamptz (1982: 278, 303) gives derivations both from *phegos* and from the toponyms Phegeia/Phegia in Arkadia and Phegos in Thessaly. Certainly there are cases of Trojan names formed from toponyms in areas of Greece, but the pattern of naming in this section of the poem makes it clear that Phegaios' name derives from a local source, the prominent oak tree at the Skaian Gate.

36. An oak tree is mentioned but not given a precise location at 6.237, 9.354, and 11.170; all of these instances probably refer to the oak at the Skaian Gate. See Kirk on 5.692-93. On the paucity of landmarks on the Trojan plain, see Andersson (1976) 17, Thornton (1984) 150-61, and Hainsworth (1993) 243-44; see also Clay (2007) 247-48, who studies the Trojan battlefield from a perspective inspired by Pietro Janni's concept of hodological space (Janni 1984) and and Kevin Lynch's work on mental maps (Lynch 1960).

37. See Luce (1998) 28-29. Thomas and Stubbings (1963: 301) suggest that Dardaniē should be taken as the name for a region rather than the name of a town.

(20.215-40). Aineias is disaffected from the house of Ilos, and in fact has *mēnis* against Priam, who does not honor him (13.459-61).[38]

Ida is also where the rivers of Troy have their origin (12.18-23). This is more than a matter of water supply; as the rivers are gods, the fact that Ida is their source makes the mountain an integral part of the city's physical and religious topography. Thus, even if Idaios' name is essentially equivalent to "Trojan," this correspondence underscores the mountain's importance for Trojan identity. However, a brief consideration of the mountain's importance not only as the original seat of Troy and the source of its rivers but as a locus of communication between mortals and immortals will show that Idaios' name derives from the mountain's place in Troy's sacred landscape.

For the Trojans, Ida is a nexus of contact with the gods. Dardanos, a son of Zeus, founded the city of Dardania on Ida's slopes (20.215-18); Dardanos' great-grandson Ilos would go on to found Ilion.[39] Aphrodite comes to Anchises as he is herding his flocks on Ida. The *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* has an extensive description of the the mountain (53-70); when Aphrodite arrives there, the mountain is called "many-fountained Ida, the mother of wild beasts" (Ἴδην δ' ἵκανεν πολυπίδακα μητέρα θηρῶν, 68). This line also occurs in the *Iliad* three times (8.47, 14.283, 15.151); each time, it is part of a description of a god arriving at the mountain. This repetition suggests that there is something of a type-scene of a god arriving at Ida, testimony to

38. On Aineias' *mēnis*, see Nagy (1979) 265-75.
39. The founding of Troy is not narrated in the *Iliad*, but Ilos is named as the founder of Ilion by Apollodorus (3.12.1-3), Diodoros (26F1.12), and a scholion to Lykophron 29.

its importance as a place of contact between the divine and mortal spheres.[40] The Judgment of Paris, which is never narrated in Homer and is only briefly alluded to once (24.28-30),[41] also takes place on the slopes of Ida,[42] where Paris was abandoned as a child due to portents that he would be the destruction of his father's house.[43]

For the *Iliad*, however, the most important divine presence on Ida is that of Zeus. Zeus habitually views the progress of the war from Mount Ida (8.47-52, 8.207, 17.567, 20.56-59). The other Olympian gods know that Ida is a favorite haunt of Zeus: when Hera suggests to Poseidon that the Olympians jointly aid the Akhaians in defiance of Zeus' commands, she says that if there was united opposition to Zeus he would be left all alone on Ida (αὐτοῦ κ' ἔνθ' ἀκάχοιτο καθήμενος οἷος ἐν Ἴδῃ, 8.207). The Trojans are aware that Zeus spends time there: Priam prays to him as "Father Zeus who rules from Ida" (Ζεῦ πάτερ Ἰδηθεν μεδέων, 24.308). Accordingly, Zeus has a *temenos* and an altar at Gargaros, one of the peaks of Ida, and when Zeus recalls that Hektor had sacrificed to him "on the peaks of many-folded Ida" (ἐμὸν δ' ὀλοφύρεται ἦτορ / Ἕκτορος, ὅς μοι πολλὰ βοῶν ἐπὶ μηρί' ἔκηεν / Ἴδης ἐν κορυφῇσι πολυπτύχου, 22.169-71), he is presumably referring to this altar.[44] But even though this altar is in a specific place on Ida, which at times

---

40. In the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, Aphrodite mentions the abductions of Ganymedes and Tithonos, both Dardanids; she does not say where these abductions happened, but as she is comparing Anchises with Ganymedes and Tithonos, it seems possible that they were abducted from Ida, and Zeus' association with the mountain makes it likely that his abduction of Ganymedes occurred there.
41. See Reinhardt (1960) 13-46.
42. See Proklos' summary of the *Kypria* (fr. 1 Allen).
43. Pindar *Paian* 8a, scholion A on *Iliad* 3.325 (where Hekabe has a dream that she gives birth to a torch that burns down Troy and the forests of Ida). Gantz (1993: 562) summarizes these sources, along with references to tragedies of Sophokles and Euripides.
44. On the resemblance of this *temenos* to a Minoan peak sanctuary, (especially Kamares on the

seems to name an immense area, and can in fact be synonymous with Priam's kingdom,[45] from Zeus' words it seems that the name Ida can be used metonymically for the precinct at Gargaros. This may, however, be more than a substitution of "Ida" for "Gargaros"; in a sense, the entire mountain can be spoken of as being sacred to Zeus. Accordingly, Idaios is an epithet of Zeus himself.[46]

Idaios' name, then, identifies him with the most prominent feature in Troy's physical and cultic topography, a location closely connected with Zeus. This connection is strengthened by Phegaios' name, which derives from a type of tree sacred to Zeus, and refers to the oak tree by the Skaian Gate. These brothers are named after two prominent features in Troy's cultic landscape, both of which are sacred to Zeus.

Phegaios' connection to Zeus does not protect him from the Akhaians, but his brother Idaios is saved by Hephaistos' intervention. Phegaios' death may in a small way foreshadow the death of Sarpedon, which inevitably occurs in accordance with fate, even though Zeus would prefer to prevent the death of his son. This applies also to the fall of Troy; though Zeus' sympathies lie with the Trojans, the city will be destroyed. Phegaios' and Idaios' connections to the cultic landscape also anticipates the impiety that accompanies the sack of Troy. The *Odyssey* suggests that it is Athene whom the Akhaians offend most greatly in the sack of Troy, which leads

---

Cretan Mt. Ida), see Luce (1998) 236n4.

45. See Luce (1998) 35.

46. Significantly, this cult-title comes into play when Patroklos kills "Laogonos, the son of Onetor, the priest of Zeus Idaios, who was honored by the people like a god" (Λαόγονον θρασὺν υἱὸν Ὀνήτορος, ὃς Διὸς ἱρεὺς / Ἰδαίου ἐτέτυκτο, θεὸς δ' ὣς τίετο δήμῳ, 16.604-605). Idaios is also an epithet of Zeus in connection with the Cretan Mt. Ida, as seen in e.g. Euripides' *Cretans*.

to the unhappy *nostoi* of many of the heroes. Zeus also figures into their fates as the master planner of their "baneful return" (*lugron...noston*, *Odyssey* 3.132).[47] The attack on Phegaios and Idaios forecasts and models an assault on the sacred objects and precincts of Zeus in the sack of the city.

Skamandrios (5.49-58)

Simoeisios is a first manifestation of the role of rivers in the Trojan landscape. A second is the Trojan Skamandrios, whom Menelaos kills with his spear. His name clearly derives from the major river of the Trojan plain, the Skamandros. Like the name Idaios, we find other Trojans with this name: Hektor's son is named Skamandrios, although interestingly enough the people call the boy Astuanax, "because only Hektor guarded Ilios" (τόν ῥ' Ἕκτωρ καλέεσκε Σκαμάνδριον, αὐτὰρ οἱ ἄλλοι / Ἀστυάνακτ'· οἷος γὰρ ἐρύετο Ἴλιον Ἕκτωρ, 6.403-404). These Trojans are further examples of the association between the people of Troy and their rivers. The biography of the Skamandrios who is killed by Menelaos does not link him directly to the river but rather focuses on his skill as a hunter whom "Artemis herself taught to shoot all the wild things the wood nurtures on the mountains" (δίδαξε γὰρ Ἄρτεμις αὐτὴ / βάλλειν ἄγρια πάντα, τά τε τρέφει οὔρεσιν ὕλη, 5.51-52). The location of this forest is not specified, but it is hard not to think of the slopes of Mt. Ida. Skamandrios dies ironically, in a manner fitting the beasts he hunted in the mountains: Menelaos' spear strikes him in the back as he flees. In his death we witness an inversion of the Trojan relationship to the landscape similar to that seen in pastoral imagery.

47. See Clay (1983: 39-53) on Athene's wrath towards the victorious Achaians.

Whereas Skamandrios was a hunter in the forested mountains, he is now prey on the plains in front of the city.

Phereklos and Pedaios (5.59-75)

After Skamandrios' death, the Akhaian Meriones kills Phereklos, the son of the shipwright who made the ship on which Paris sailed to Sparta. After this Meges kills Pedaios (5.69-75). Though Pedaios himself resides in the city of Troy, his name is an indication of the web of interconnections between the city and the towns of its territory. Pedaios' name is derived from a town in the Trojan hinterland called Pedaion. This town is the home of Imbrios, a Trojan killed by Teuker (13.172).[48] Aside from this etymological link, any connection between Pedaios and Pedaion is obscure. However, there is an interesting similarity between the biography of Pedaios and that of Imbrios. Pedaios is an illegitimate son of Antenor, raised by Antenor's wife Theano as if he were one of her own children (5.70-71). Pedaios presumably lives in his father's household in Troy. Imbrios' wife is Medesikaste, an illegitimate daughter of Priam. Prior to the arrival of the Achaians, Imbrios and Medesikaste lived in Pedaion. It is not entirely clear where Medesikaste was raised, but it is clear that she differs from Priam's legitimate daughters in living in her husband's town. At some point, Medesikaste must have been sent away from Priam's household, or perhaps she was never part of Priam's household. This separation from Priam's

48. Von Kamptz (1982) 311.

household also occurs with his illegitimate sons, who dwell in towns outside of Troy.[49] Once the Akhaian ships arrive, Imbrios goes to Troy (13.172-76):

> ναῖε δὲ Πήδαιον πρὶν ἐλθεῖν υἷας Ἀχαιῶν,
> κούρην δὲ Πριάμοιο νόθην ἔχε, Μηδεσικάστην·
> αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Δαναῶν νέες ἤλυθον ἀμφιέλισσαι,
> ἂψ ἐς Ἴλιον ἦλθε, μετέπρεπε δὲ Τρώεσσι,
> ναῖε δὲ πὰρ Πριάμῳ· ὃ δέ μιν τίεν ἶσα τέκεσσι.
>
> He lived in Pedaion before the sons of the Akhaians came,
> and had as wife an illegitimate daughter of Priam, Medesikaste:
> then when the curved ships of the Danaans came,
> he came back to Ilion, and was preeminent among the Trojans,
> and he lived in Priam's house: for he honored him like one of his children.

Imbrios is accepted into Priam's house as Pedaios was accepted into Antenor and Theano's house, and Imbrios is treated like one of Priam's children, just as Theano treated Pedaios like one of her children. There is an interesting contrast here between the way Pedaios and Imbrios are brought into the household of the father of an illegitimate child versus the *nothoi* who are sent away from their fathers' households.[50] The relegation of these offspring spreads the descendants of the ruling lineages throughout the Trojan hinterland, and provides a ready supply of minor characters whose deaths, by virtue of their connection with the houses of Dardanos and Priam, provide a constant reminder of the impending fall of the city and the death of Priam and all his sons, and link members of the royal founding line to places whose Trojan namesakes the Greeks kill.

---

49. All of Priam's legitimate sons and daughters live in his palace (6.242-50); his sons-in-law become part of his household. Imbrios is brought into the palace as if he were the husband of one of Priam's legitimate daughters.
50. E.g., Demokoon, a *nothos* of Priam, who lives in Abudos (4.498-500).

Hypsenor (5.76-83)

The next Trojan to be killed is Hypsenor, who once again brings into focus the rivers of Troy and their vulnerability in the face of the Akhaian attack. In this passage, the cultic significance of rivers is highlighted, for Hypsenor's father, Dolopion, is the priest of the river Skamandros, who is in high esteem with the Trojan people: "he received *timē* from the *dēmos*, like a god" (θεὸς δ' ὣς τίετο δήμῳ, 5.78). This particular wording is only used of Dolopion, Agamemnon, Aineias, Thoas, and Onetor (who is a priest of Idaian Zeus).[51] The unusual degree of honor accorded to Dolopion by the Trojans indicates the high status both of Skamandros and his priest. Here the idea of the cultic landscape of Troy being slain appears once again; the connection is distant, but the death of the son of the priest of Skamandros foreshadows Akhilleus' conflict with the river, and in a more general way mirrors the transformation of the Skamandros' plain from a place where Trojans herd their flocks and herds into a killing field. This transformation is brought forward in another way by the river simile which follows Hypsenor's death, in which Diomedes is compared to a river in flood (5.84-94):

> ὣς οἳ μὲν πονέοντο κατὰ κρατερὴν ὑσμίνην·
> Τυδεΐδην δ' οὐκ ἂν γνοίης ποτέροισι μετείη
> ἠὲ μετὰ Τρώεσσιν ὁμιλέοι ἦ μετ' Ἀχαιοῖς.
> θῦνε γὰρ ἅμ πεδίον ποταμῷ πλήθοντι ἐοικὼς
> χειμάρρῳ, ὅς τ' ὤκα ῥέων ἐκέδασσε γεφύρας·
> τὸν δ' οὔτ' ἄρ τε γέφυραι ἐεργμέναι ἰσχανόωσιν,
> οὔτ' ἄρα ἕρκεα ἴσχει ἀλωάων ἐριθηλέων
> ἐλθόντ' ἐξαπίνης ὅτ' ἐπιβρίσῃ Διὸς ὄμβρος·
> πολλὰ δ' ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἔργα κατήριπε κάλ' αἰζηῶν·

51. On the significance of this phrase see Nagy (1979) 149.

ὣς ὑπὸ Τυδεΐδῃ πυκιναὶ κλονέοντο φάλαγγες
Τρώων, οὐδ' ἄρα μιν μίμνον πολέες περ ἐόντες.

So they toiled in the fierce battle.
But you would not have known whose side the son of Tydeus took,
whether he was a comrade of the Trojans or the Akhaians.
For he raged across the plain like a river in winter flood,
which, flowing swiftly, sweeps away the embankments;
the well built embankments do not restrain it,
nor do the fences of the luxuriant orchards hold back its
sudden onset when the storm of Zeus drives it,
and beneath it many beautiful works of men fall in ruins.
So beneath the son of Tydeus the packed ranks of the Trojans
were driven in confusion, nor did they stand their ground, though they were many.

The image of the torrential rivers that was applied to both armies as this day of combat began is now exclusively applied to Diomedes. The image of the two rivers with separate sources combining into one torrent finds a counterpoint here. Diomedes is so terrifying that an observer can no longer determine which army he belongs to. In the earlier simile, both armies lost their separate identities and were mixed together into a single chaotic flood; here Diomedes, pictured as a raging torrent, can no longer be identified with either army and seems to threaten both equally**.** Like the earlier simile, this sight is focalized through a distant witness, but this time instead of an anonymous shepherd, the observer is the generalizing second-person singular "you." A point of emphasis in the simile of Diomedes as a river is the destruction of man-made constructions: both dikes (γεφύρας, 5.88) and the walls of vineyards (ἕρκεα, 5.89) fall before its force. This is an image of the destruction of a particular aspect of the landscape, the structures that safeguard agricultural production. As in the previous river simile, the depiction of Diomedes as a raging river departs from the general association of Greeks with the sea. Here it seems to be

the loss of identity that motivates the simile; as Fenno notes, Diomedes is like a stream when he is most like the Trojans.[52]

Exploits of Diomedes (5.124-65)

This description of Diomedes as a rampaging river is followed by an encounter with Pandaros, son of Lykaon, who wounds Diomedes. Far from stopping him, this wounding provides an opportunity for more heroic exploits, after Athene gives Diomedes the same *menos* that Tydeus had (5.124-32). There follows a section in which Diomedes rapidly kills four pairs of brothers. Each pair is briefly described with just enough detail to give them an identity and to give their deaths some emotional or symbolic impact, and each pair has associations with the landscape that reinforce those made by characters earlier in this battle narrative. This series is preceded by a lion simile (5.136-43) that carries over a detail of the previous river simile: the lion leaps over a wall of a sheepfold, and the frightened shepherd "goes around the farm buildings," (ἀλλὰ κατὰ σταθμοὺς δύεται, 5.140). The action of this simile happens on a farmstead, and the idea of the constructions of men being of no use against the savage forces of uncontrolled nature reappears.

After this simile Diomedes kills Astynoos and Hyperion (5.144-47). These two men have a kind of corporate identity. Hyperion is a "shepherd of the people" (ποιμένα λαῶν, 5.144), which would be an equally appropriate description for Astynoos, whose name might mean either

52. Fenno (2005) 490.

"one who directs his understanding for the city" or "one who is well-minded for the city."[53] The lion who ravages the sheepfold of Trojans has now killed their shepherds.

The second pair that Diomedes kills are the brothers Abas and Polyidos, who are the sons of the dream-interpreter Eurydamas (5.148-51). While there is no obvious connection to the Trojan landscape in the history, genealogy, or names of these brothers, the fact that their father is a dream-interpreter links them to Phegaios and Idaios, the sons of Dares, and to Hypsenor the son of Dolopion, all children of priests, and reminds us that the war is threatening the religious personnel and the religious landscape of the city.

Xanthos (5.152-58)

The third pair, Xanthos and Thoon (5.152-58), are sons of Phainops. Thoon and Phainops are fairly unremarkable. Other Trojans are named Thoon (11.422, 12.140, 13.545), and Phainops appears as a name for another Trojan and a man from Abudos (17.312, 17.583). Xanthos, however, is a more interesting figure, who once again calls attention to the rivers of Troy. Xanthos appears as a personal name twenty-two times in the *Iliad*, but the son of Phainops is the only human with this name. Elsewhere it is the name of one of Hektor's horses (8.185); one of Akhilleus' immortal horses is also named Xanthos (16.149-54, 19.400, 405).[54] Sixteen times Xanthos is the name of a river. Xanthos is a river in Lykia, and Xanthos is the name that gods use for the Trojan river known to mortals as Skamandros (20.74).[55] This warrior's name

53. Von Kamptz (1982) 75.
54. Interestingly, one of Hektor's horses is named Pedasos, which is also the name of a Trojan killed by Euryalos in Book 6, and a town on Ida (6.33-35).
55. On cases of alternative human and divine names, see Kirk on 1.403-404, West on *Theogony*

connects him with Troy's most important river, and so his name, like that of Simoesios or Skamandrios, ties him to a major feature of local topography. However, the fact that Xanthos is the gods' name for the river might point to a greater significance for the name.

In most of its occurrences Xanthos both as a proper noun and as an adjective signifies immortality. Akhilleus' horse is the offspring of Zephuros and the harpy Podarge, born on the banks of Okeanos; as befits a being with such a pedigree, Xanthos is explicitly said to be immortal (16.150-54).[56] The association with immortality is clearest in the case of the river Skamandros, which is called Xanthos in the language of the immortals (20.74); Skamandros is himself a god, like all rivers, but unlike other rivers, who are the sons of Okeanos, Skamandros is said to be sprung from Zeus (14.433-34, 21.1-2, 24.692-93). The Lykian Xanthos is also associated with immortality simply by virtue of its being a river, but its connection with Sarpedon gives the river another link to the theme of immortality. Sarpedon and Glaukos have a *temenos* by the river Xanthos, given to them by the *dēmos* (12.313-14); after his death, Sarpedon is returned to Lykia. While the *Iliad* denies the overt expression of heroic immortalization, Gregory Nagy has argued that the narrative of Sarpedon's death and return to Lykia contains

---

387, Clay (1972) 127-31.

56. Hektor's horse Xanthos is perhaps an exception to the association of this name with immortality. Still, it is worth remarking on two points in Hektor's address to the team of horses that includes Xanthos. First, they drink wine (8.189), and second, they have been provisioned by Andromache, the daughter of "great-hearted Eetion" (8.187). Pedasos was captured from the city of Eetion (τόν ῥά ποτ' Ἠετίωνος ἐλὼν πόλιν ἤγαγ' Ἀχιλλεύς, 16.153), which raises the possibility that Hektor's horses are from the same herd as Pedasos, who is clearly a remarkable horse: he is the only horse to receive the epithet *amumon* (16.152), and though he is mortal, he keeps pace with immortal horses (ὃς καὶ θνητὸς ἐὼν ἕπεθ' ἵπποις ἀθανάτοισι, 16.154).

implicit indications of his immortalization.[57] In extra-Homeric tradition, Sarpedon's immortality is unquestioned.

As an adjective, *xanthos* ('blond") is associated with mortals who are given immortality. It is used for Rhadamanthys, who dwells in Elysium (*Odyssey* 4.564) and Ganymedes, who lives with the immortals on Olympos (*Hymn to Aphrodite* 202), and often in connection with Menelaos, who is the only Homeric hero who is said to receive immortality (*Odyssey* 4.561-69).[58]

As I noted above, the Xanthos whom Diomedes kills is the only mortal man in the *Iliad* to hold this name. He is thus especially associated with his namesake, the river Xanthos/ Skamandros, and so his death at the hands of Diomedes is a preview of the conflict between Akhilleus and Skamandros in Book 21. Since the narrative begins by comparing the armies to two rivers coming together, and since Diomedes has just been compared to a river, or even both, naming his victim Xanthos echoes the theme of two combating rivers, and the further associations evoked by the image, including Akhilleus and the Skamandros and the figurative Greek assault on the landscape of Troy. But the warrior Xanthos' name also associates him with the Lykian river, and provides a connection to Sarpedon, who will be wounded but not killed by Tlepolemos (5.633-67) some five hundred lines after Xanthos' death.

---

57. Nagy (1979) 122-42. At *Iliad* 16.679 Apollo bathes the dead body of Sarpedon in a river before handing him to Sleep and Death to be transported to Lykia; Nagy (1979: 141n49) raises the interesting possibility that this verse could have developed from a reference to the Lykian Xanthos.
58. Nagy (1979) 209§50n2.

The fourth pair of brothers killed by Diomedes is Ekhemmon and Khromios. They are both legitimate sons of Priam, who receives the epithet *Dardanidao* (5.159). The emphasis on Priam's descent calls attention to the fact that these brothers are themselves legitimate descendants of Dardanos, and part of the ruling line of Priam. Their deaths are described in a simile (5.161-65):

> ὡς δὲ λέων ἐν βουσὶ θορὼν ἐξ αὐχένα ἄξῃ
> πόρτιος ἠὲ βοὸς ξύλοχον κάτα βοσκομενάων,
> ὣς τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐξ ἵππων Τυδέος υἱὸς
> βῆσε κακῶς ἀέκοντας, ἔπειτα δὲ τεύχε' ἐσύλα·
> ἵππους δ' οἷς ἑτάροισι δίδου μετὰ νῆας ἐλαύνειν.
>
> As a lion leaps among the cattle and breaks the neck
> of a calf or a cow as they graze in a a thicket,
> so the son of Tydeus threw them both from their chariot,
> harshly and against their will, then stripped their armor:
> and then he gave the horses to his comrades to drive to the ships.

This lion-simile continues the pastoral imagery that recurs throughout this chain of Trojan deaths. These are the first named legitimate sons of Priam to be killed in the primary fabula of the *Iliad* (a *nothos*, Demokoon, is killed by Odysseus at 4.494). As sons of Priam they are fitting recipients of this simile since their parentage makes them prominent members of the "flock" of Trojans; the simile describing this last pair of deaths forms a ring with the lion simile that precedes the deaths of Astynous and Hypeiron (5.134-44).

Aisepos and Pedasos (6.21-28)

This quick succession of Trojan deaths at the hands of Diomedes is only the beginning of his *aristeia*, which dominates the remainder of Book 5; my next chapter will discuss Diomedes' *aristeia* in detail. The Trojans and Lykians who die in this part of Book 5 are of little interest in

terms of landscape imagery, so I will move to Book 6. At the opening of this book, seven different Akhaians kill Trojans in quick succession, and there is little detail for most of the victims. However, Euryalos kills two pairs of warriors; unlike the series of pairs killed by Diomedes, only the second pair that Euryalos kills are brothers, Aisepos and Pedasos. Like other Trojans before them, these brothers have close associations with Troy's rivers and with the herding activity that the rivers support. Aisepos and Pedasos are also the offspring of the fountain nymph Abarbarea, and thus are the children of a feature of the landscape which, like rivers, supplies life-giving water to the plants, animals, and people of the Troad. Their father, Boukolion, associates these brothers with the pastoralism that is sustained by bodies of fresh water. Boukolion was a bastard son of Laomedon, so like the other *nothoi* we have seen so far, these brothers are given a connection to the Trojan ruling dynasty. Boukolion, as his name implies, is a herdsman, and this is explicitly brought forward by the narrative, which connects his herding with the conception of his sons: "while herding his sheep, he lay with the nymph in love, and she conceived and bore twin sons" (ποιμαίνων δ' ἐπ' ὄεσσι μίγη φιλότητι καὶ εὐνῇ, / ἡ δ' ὑποκυσαμένη διδυμάονε γείνατο παῖδε, 6.25-26). The names of the twins derive from Trojan toponyms: Aisepos is one of the rivers whose source lies on Ida (12.21) and Pedasos' name is the same as that of the hometown of the warrior Elatos, killed by Agammemnon just a few lines later. This town lies on the banks of the river Satinoeis (6.33-35). The pairing of a Trojan named after a river with one named after a town located on a river is a reminder of the role Troy's rivers play in supporting the community and people of Troy.

Aisepos and Pedasos have a number of biographical details that are similar to those of Simoeisios. For instance, all of these men are conceived when their parents are watching flocks, and water, in the form of a spring nymph or river, is a central feature in the story of their birth. As I discussed above in connection with Simoeisios, the biographies of these characters follow a shared pattern, as do their names, which are derived from rivers. Pedasos' name deviates only slightly from this pattern, as his name comes from a town located on a river. Each of these characters possesses a name and biography that emphasizes his connection with the landscape.

The battle narrative I have discussed in this chapter is particularly thick with Trojan casualties whose names and backgrounds associate them with, and virtually assimilate them to, their native landscape. But examples of this type of character are also found elsewhere in the *Iliad.* On the third day of battle, Aias kills a Trojan named Satinos (14.442-48), whose name clearly derives from the river Satinoeis.[59] Satinos' parentage is similar to that of Aisepos and Pedasos: his mother is an unnamed nymph, with whom Enops lay "as he was herding cattle by the banks of the Satinoeis" (Ἤνοπι βουκολέοντι παρ' ὄχθας Σατνιόεντος, 14.445). Note the participle βουκολέοντι; the name of Boukolion, the father of Aisepos and Pedasos comes from the same root.[60] The naming of Satinos and the biographical information that accompanies his death shows that the assimilation of minor Trojan characters to the Trojan landscape is not a phenomenon found exclusively in the narrative of the first day of battle, but is a recurrent feature of the *Iliad*'s imagery. Nonetheless, it is significant that the introductory similes figuring the

59. Von Kamptz (1982) 302.
60. See Kirk on 6.21-22.

Akhaians as a chaotic, destructive force of nature (4.422-28) and characterizing the Trojans, by contrast, with peaceable pastoral imagery (4.433-38), are immediately followed by a lengthy catalog of individual and paired Trojan deaths that repeatedly lay stress on the victims' connections, by name and biography, with local toponyms and cult, and with agriculture and pastoralism in the peaceful, well-watered countryside.

Conclusion

To conclude, I shall set out several ways the landscape imagery of the section I have examined in this chapter, that is, the poem's first extended battle narrative, informs the *Iliad* as a whole. First, the identification of Trojan warriors with places in the Trojan countryside, whether outlying towns or rural locations, contributes to a well-known characteristic of the *Iliad*, its incorporation of events from earlier stages of the war into its own narrative, whether through allusion, reminiscence, or symbolic repetition, so that the poem's action in effect recapitulates the entire war.[61] The deaths of Trojans who are associated with outlying areas symbolically recapitulate the ravaging of the countryside and the sacking of towns that has taken place earlier in the war. These are events of the sort that are explicitly recalled by Andromache's description of the sack of Thebe (6.413-24). Second, then, the focus on the countryside reminds us that the fall of Troy is not just the fall of a single city but the fall of a kingdom, with vast numbers of allies. The killing of the Trojan victims in this section and the symbolic devastation of the countryside

61. This quality of the *Iliad* has been extensively discussed. See, among others, Whitman (1958) 39-45, 267-71; Else (1957) 585-86; Kullmann (1960) 366-68; Schein (1984) 19-25; Edwards (1987) 188-99; Taplin (1992) 82-109, 257-84; Burgess (2009) 65-66.

they represent suggests the deaths of the peoples not just of the city of Troy but of its territory, and of its allies.

More important for my overall argument, however, is the way the landscape imagery of this section evokes theogonic myth. Water imagery assimilating Akhaians to the sea and Trojans to the rivers of their territory portrays the Trojan War as a new outbreak of a primeval conflict between salt and fresh water. In this elemental conflict, the Greeks are aligned with the sea, understood in both Near Eastern and Greek myth as a chaotic force and a threat to cosmic order; the *Iliad*'s water imagery thus implies that the Greeks have the potential to disrupt the cosmic order. The potentially disruptive effect of heroic endeavor upon the society of the gods is further explored in Diomedes' *aristeia*, as I shall show in my next chapter.

A final point to make is that the violence figuratively directed at the Trojan landscape by the Akhaians adapts a motif of the overpopulation of the earth which in some extra-Homeric sources is the root cause of the Trojan War. A fragment of the proem of the Cyclic epic *Kypria* preserved in a scholion to the *Iliad* reports that the earth was weighed down by an overabundance of humanity; Zeus took pity upon her and decided to relieve overpopulation through war.[62] The *Iliad* has adapted the motif of the overpopulation of the earth in two ways. The first is the assimilation of the Trojans to their landscape that has formed the subject matter of this chapter, and the substitution of the Trojan landscape for the earth as a whole. Second is the move from overpopulation as the cause of earth's suffering to the Akhaian attack against the Trojans. At first glance, these might not seem like similar phenomena; the harm caused by

62. Scholion AD to *Iliad* 1.5 (*Cypria* fr. 1 Bernabé and Davies).

overpopulation is unintentional, whereas the Akhaian attack is deliberate. But offensive human behavior is sometimes joined to overpopulation as the motivation for a divine plan to relieve the overburdened earth. The same scholion that quotes the proem of the *Kypria* precedes the quotation with a prose account of the war's origins in which earth is troubled both by overpopulation and also by the lack of piety among men. Near Eastern texts supply an abundance of examples of a divine plan to relieve the earth of an excessive and overweening population, and it is likely that the Greeks got the idea from the Near East.[63] In the Babylonian poem *Atrahasis*, when humans become numerous, the land "bellow[s] like a bull";[64] the gods, annoyed by the noise and uproar of humanity, plot a series of disasters to reduce human numbers, culminating in the flood. The word used for the "noise" of humanity (*rigmu*) is also applied to the rebellion of the Igigi, the younger generation of gods, earlier in the poem; Robert Oden has argued that the "noise" of humanity signals a rebellion against the cosmic order and an attempt to encroach upon divine prerogatives.[65] These examples of a link between overpopulation and offensive behavior suggest that overpopulation by itself is an expression of the troublesome and rebellious nature of humanity. Afflicting the earth through excessive numbers is thus not so different from afflicting the earth through intentional violence.

As I mentioned above, the deaths of Trojans from towns in the Trojan backcountry recall the sacking of outlying towns during the period of the war that precedes the primary fabula of

---

63. See Kirk (1970) 116-17, Scodel (1982) 40-41, Hendel (1987) 18-20, Burkert (1992) 100-103, Koenen (1994), Mayer (1996), and West (1997) 480-82.
64. *Atrahasis* 1.354.
65. On the connotation of *rigmu* see Oden (1981) 208-10; Mayer (1996: 5) also points out that *rigmu* describes the activity both of humankind and of the Igigi.

the *Iliad*. In a similar fashion, through the figurative attack upon the Trojan landscape, the *Iliad* incorporates even earlier events into its narrative and reenacts the story of the war's origins as part of the action of the war itself. In the overpopulation motif, humanity in general is the cause of earth's suffering, but in the Iliadic reenactment a specific subset of humanity, the Akhaians, are now responsible for afflicting the earth. Like their affiliation with the sea, the Akhaians' figurative attack upon the Trojan landscape represents them as threats to the order of the cosmos.

Chapter Three: The *Aristeia* of Diomedes

Book 5 of the *Iliad* is devoted to the *aristeia* of Diomedes, in the course of which he fights and defeats not only mortals, but even gods. The episode is structured as a series of carefully managed climaxes, each greater than the last. The killing of the Trojan ally Pandaros and the wounding of Aineias and then his mother Aphrodite are narrated in rapid succession; then, after a scene on Olympos, which may have well created the impression that the *aristeia* had concluded, the narrative returns to the battlefield, and Diomedes confronts Apollo. Finally, with Athene at his side, Diomedes confronts Ares, wounds him, and drives him from the battlefield. In this chapter I will argue that Diomedes' combats with gods develop the portrayal of the Akhaians as a threat to cosmic order, a portrayal that I have identified and analyzed in my first two chapters. There I showed how this depiction of the Akhaian army is created through landscape imagery that alludes to earlier stages of cosmic history and so aligns the Akhaians with forces of disruption. The portions of Diomedes' *aristeia* I analyze in this chapter differ in two ways from the material analyzed in earlier chapters: first, the threat to cosmic stability is explored directly in the actions of a character, rather than allusively through landscape imagery. Second, in Diomedes' *aristeia* the focus of the narrative narrows from the army to a single character. Ultimately, Diomedes' combats with the gods reveal two dangers that the events of the Trojan War pose to the gods: first, in attacking and wounding gods, Diomedes transgresses the boundary between mortals and gods and so poses a threat to a stable cosmic hierarchy. But

Diomedes acts with the support and encouragement of Athene, which highlights a second problem illustrated by his *aristeia*: the divine community is divided by internal strife, and the gods' support of their mortal favorites both manifests and exacerbates divine strife.

My argument will run as follows. A well-known characteristic of Diomedes is his similarity to Akhilleus, such that he becomes a substitute for the absent hero in the first half of the poem. Some features of Diomedes' *aristeia* have been described as anticipatory doublets of those in Akhilleus'. Another similarity between the two heroes is that allusions to the succession myth that most naturally apply to Akhilleus appear in connection with Diomedes. His resemblance to Akhilleus as well as the fact that he is performing an *aristeia* mark him out as exceptional, but at the same time, as the foremost warrior of the Akhaians, Diomedes can serve as a representative for the army as a whole. Characterizations of the Akhaians collectively as a force of chaos are thus concretized in the person of Diomedes.

Diomedes is often urged to follow the example of his father Tydeus. But the same stories of Tydeus' past which Diomedes is urged to emulate reveal his father as a rash and unrestrained hero. Diomedes, therefore, is encouraged to claim a paternal legacy of reckless deeds that led to an ignominious fate. The first part of Diomedes' *aristeia* culminates in his wounding of Aphrodite, who characterizes Diomedes' action as a breach of the distinction between mortal and immortal—a distinction which ought to be inviolate. Even though Athene has authorized Diomedes to fight against Aphrodite, the attack on the goddess leaves him open to a charge of recklessness. As she consoles Aphrodite on Olympos, the goddess Dione points out the danger Athene's sponsorship of Diomedes presents to the divine community. Mortals wound gods when

the gods fight with one another; in other words, strife between Athene and Aphrodite is the true cause of the wounding. Divine strife is inherently destabilizing to the society of the gods, and Athene provides evidence of ongoing strife when she engages in verbal rancor designed to embarrass Aphrodite still further.

The *aristeia* returns to the theme of mortal offenses against the gods as Diomedes nearly meets with destruction at the hands of Apollo. Diomedes attacks Aineias, who is being carried away from the battlefield by Apollo, four times. The first three times, Apollo pushes Diomedes back, but on the fourth, the god commands him to yield and reminds him of the categorical difference between gods and mortals; Diomedes then gives way. The pattern of repeating an action three times and then failing on the fourth is found several other times in the *Iliad*, with the failure of the fourth attempt often resulting in death. In Book 8, Diomedes enacts the "three times" pattern once more, as he thrice considers turning and fighting as Zeus thrice thunders in a sign to retreat. In both instances of the pattern, Diomedes displays the reckless temper of his father Tydeus, and courts his own destruction by resisting the gods.

Diomedes' third confrontation with a god takes place with Athene at his side serving as his charioteer. Athene is in fact performing her own *aristeia*, though she remains invisible throughout, and her involvement in the action is such that Diomedes becomes her surrogate as she guides the hero's spear into Ares' belly. Not only does the goddess' involvement illustrate Dione's argument that instances of mortals wounding gods are caused by divine strife, but also that the wounding of Aphrodite has led to an intensification of divine strife, as evidenced by the fact that Athene is closely involved in the battle and that she and Ares are only barely removed

from open combat. The ensuing scene on Olympos carries the theme of divine strife still further. Zeus calls Ares the "most hateful of the gods who hold Olympos" (ἔχθιστος...θεῶν οἳ Ὄλυμπον ἔχουσιν, 5.888), and this hatred can be seen as the reason he allows Athene to drive Ares from the battlefield. But with Ares' departure, the Akhaians gain the upper hand, and this interferes with Zeus' stated plan to honor Akhilleus by giving the Trojans victory in his absence. Zeus' anger with Ares, in other words, causes the derailment of his own *boulē*. Strife between gods, then, not only threatens the stability of divine society, but causes the plot of the poem to be thrown off the course Zeus had planned.

The Best of the Akhaians

Diomedes is the first hero in the *Iliad* to receive an *aristeia*, and ancient interpreters puzzled over this choice. Aias had been called the best of the Akhaians by far after Akhilleus in the Catalogue of Ships (2.768-69), but elsewhere the army hopes that Aias, Diomedes, or Agamemnon will be selected to face Hektor in single combat (7.178-80), implying that the three are considered equally good fighters. An explanation found in the scholia points out that Aias is unparalleled as a defender, but Diomedes and Agamemnon are better on the attack. This explanation is, I think, correct, but another can be adduced: of the fighters who are thought to rank just after Akhilleus, Diomedes is most like him. Scholars have often noted similarities between the two, which are so extensive as to make Diomedes into a substitute for the absent hero in the first portion of the epic.[1] But there is also an important contrast: Diomedes

1. On Diomedes' similarities to Akhilleus, see e.g. Whitman (1958) 167, Redfield (1975) 3, Kullmann (1984) 314, Taplin (1992) 135, Lang (1995) 154-56, Alden (2000) 173-78.

scrupulously avoids conflict with Agamemnon, even in the face of a rebuking speech delivered by the Akhaian leader as he reviews the troops in the *Epipolesis* (4.365-421). Diomedes' respect for Agamemnon's authority led Oliver Taplin to declare that "Diomedes is Achilleus without the complications..."[2] The similarity extends to the language used by the narrator to describe each hero. During Diomedes' *aristeia* he is twice called the "best of the Akhaians" (ἄριστος Ἀχαιῶν). Agamemnon and Aias (the best defensive warrior after Akhilleus) are also said to be the "best of the Akhaians," but in the *Iliad*, this distinction most properly applies to Akhilleus.[3] The first time Diomedes is called the "best of the Akhaians" creates a sinister parallel to Akhilleus: Pandaros has just shot Diomedes with an arrow, and boasts that the "best of the Akhaians has been struck, and will not long endure" (βέβληται γὰρ ἄριστος Ἀχαιῶν, οὐδέ ἕ φημι / δήθ' ἀνσχήσεσθαι κρατερὸν βέλος, 5.103-104). This scene would have no doubt reminded audiences of Akhilleus' death at the arrow of another Trojan archer, and Pandaros' mention that Apollo urged him to Troy from Lykia (5.105) would be a further reminder of the god's role in Akhilleus' death.[4]

A consequence of Diomedes' resemblance to Akhilleus is that certain features of his *aristeia* take on characteristics of a succession myth. As I discuss in the next section, Diomedes is often encouraged to follow the example of his father Tydeus; the charioteer Sthenelos boasts that he and Diomedes are better than their fathers by far (ἡμεῖς τοι πατέρων μέγ' ἀμείνονες εὐχόμεθ' εἶναι, 4.405). Similar language is used of the hundred-handed Briareos, whom Thetis summons to avert an attempt to overthrow Zeus. Briareos is "greater than his father in strength" (ὃ γὰρ αὖτε

2. Taplin (1992) 135.
3. Nagy (1979) 26-35.
4. See Nagy (1979) 30-31.

βίην οὖ πατρὸς ἀμείνων, 1.404). Laura Slatkin has shown that this description of Briareos echoes language that is elsewhere linked with Akhilleus.[5] Thetis was destined to bear a son greater than his father; once Zeus learned of this prophecy, he broke off his plan to "marry" her and instead ensured that she was married to the mortal Peleus. He thus avoided fathering a son who could overthrow him and ensured the stability of his own rule.

Another factor that draws Diomedes into the pattern of the succession myth is the support he enjoys from Athene. She is one of a coalition of gods whose present antipathy towards the Trojans and resistance to Zeus' plans reenacts their earlier attempt to overthrow Zeus.[6] As a protégé of Athene, Diomedes is closely involved in her plans, even if he has no knowledge of events on Olympos. But there is a still closer parallel between Athene and Diomedes: she is by his side as he wounds Ares, and she even guides Diomedes' spear into Ares' belly. The wounding of Ares is an exploit of Athene as much as it is an exploit of Diomedes; as I will argue, at this point Athene is performing an *aristeia* of her own.

Diomedes' stellar exploits and his resemblance to Akhilleus mark him out as exceptional. At the same time, as the best of the Akhaians (for the moment), Diomedes epitomizes the Akhaian army.[7] In previous chapters I have shown how the Akhaians are depicted as threats to cosmic order, through allusions that characterize them as a Typhoeus-like monster, through assimilation of the Akhaians to the chaotic element of salt water, and through landscape imagery that transforms the overburdening of the earth under overpopulation into the killing by the

5. See Slatkin (1991) 69-77.
6. See Lang (1983) 147-48.
7. See Whitman (1958) 165-69, 265-66.

Akhaians of warriors who personify the Trojan landscape . The depiction of the Akhaians as a collective danger to the order of things now finds expression in the actions of a single brilliant individual—Diomedes.

Memories of the Father

Diomedes' father Tydeus was one of the Seven Against Thebes, whose campaign against that city was the subject of a flourishing epic tradition. The *Iliad* draws upon this epic past as Diomedes is several times urged to emulate his father, and implicitly urged to outdo him when others claim that he does not measure up to his father's example. The notion that a hero should follow the example of his father is typical. Tydeus, however, was a rash hero who committed *atasthalia*, unrestrained and culpable deeds, and so following his example would require Diomedes to equal or even outdo his father in recklessness.[8] Since Diomedes fights with gods, the danger that he will do so without restraint is ominous. Athene authorizes his attacks on Aphrodite and Ares, but the encouragement of one god does not justify offenses against another.[9] Diomedes' attempts to kill Aineias while he is under the protection of Apollo, made contrary to the instructions of Athene, are more clearly unrestrained deeds, and here it seems that Diomedes goes beyond his father in recklessness.

---

8. On ἀτασθαλία and its derivatives, see Cook (1995) 23-24 and (1999) 149-50 with note 1, Nagler (1990), Nagy (1999) 162-63.
9. See Alden (2000) 123-28.

Many speakers in the *Iliad* have occasion to mention the deeds of Tydeus.[10] In the course of urging the Akhaians to battle after Pandaros has wounded Menelaos, Agamemnon unfavorably contrasts Diomedes' current behavior with Tydeus' exploits against the Thebans (4.370-400). Later Athene uses a similar comparison (5.800-13) to urge Diomedes to return to battle after he has been wounded. Diomedes himself is the speaker who most frequently refers to Tydeus' history. In two prayers to Athene, Diomedes reminds the goddess of her previous support of Tydeus (5.115-20, 10.284-94) in the hopes that she will aid him as she aided his father. Later he brings forward Tydeus as a way of lending authority to his advice on strategy (14.126-127). Diomedes wants to counter any impression that his youth invalidates his counsels by emphasizing his illustrious family history; his account includes not only Tydeus but his grandfather Oineus and his great-grandfather Portheus. Diomedes' family history is also important in his encounter with Glaukos in Book 6. There Diomedes mentions that he has no memory of Tydeus, since he perished at Thebes when Diomedes was a child (6.222-23). Instead, the history of a previous generation proves crucial: the discovery of an ancestral tie of *xenia* between Diomedes' and Glaukos' grandfathers facilitates the famous exchange of armor. The frequency of other references to Diomedes' lineage and the use of Tydeus as a paradigm is

10. Alden (2000) 112-42 discusses the paradigmatic use of Tydeus as part of a more extensive "debate in para-narrative" on the desirability of divine favor. While it may be true that the favoritism of a deity can have undesirable consequences, Alden's implicit assumption that a hero can choose or refuse divine favor is a bit puzzling (though see Alden 127n25, where she allows that there would be undesirable consequences if Diomedes disregarded Athene's injunction to attack Aphrodite and Ares).

reinforced by the use of the patronymic *Tudeides*, which reinforces the idea that the son must live up to the reputation of the father.[11]

Genealogy is an important component of a Homeric hero's identity. It provides a basis for a hero's status, as for instance in Aineias' lengthy exposition of his ancestry in response to Akhilleus' taunts (20.200-40). But that same episode also illustrates that ancestry can serve as the basis of insult: Akhilleus brings up the uncomfortable fact that Aineias' Assarakid lineage is excluded from political power (20.179-83). Another kind of rebuke based on genealogy is that one is not living up to one's father's reputation, or that someone is not a true son of one's father. Tlepolemos' accusation that Sarpedon lies when he says that he is the son of Zeus (5.635-37) is one example. But the frequency with which ancestry is deployed in connection with Diomedes is unusual; it seems to be a point of special interest. It is possible that Diomedes' ancestry was a focal point in non-Homeric epic. The *Epigonoi*, in which Diomedes and his allies succeed in sacking Thebes a generation after the Seven had failed, would have provided fertile ground for comparing several father-son pairs and would have supplied ample opportunity to compare Diomedes with Tydeus.

Tydeus is an important model for Diomedes, as is any Homeric hero's father; but Tydeus is an especially ambiguous, and even dangerous paradigm for Diomedes to follow.[12] On their surface, Agamemnon and Athene's rebukes present Tydeus as a positive model meant to spur Diomedes on to feats of heroism. But other speakers supply negative details of Tydeus' career,

11. On patronymics see Alden (2000) 156-58, Strasburger (1954) 24-26.
12. On ambiguity as the defining characteristic of heroic identity, see Cook (1999).

and though Menelaos and Athene minimize or elide negative features of Tydeus' character and career, their speeches can be seen to contain these details also. The portrait that emerges is ominous. Tydeus' feats are marked by a strong strain of recklessness, a trait which leads to unrestrained behavior and potential punishment from the gods. Urging Diomedes to act more like his father, then, can be interpreted as urging Diomedes to emulate a negative paradigm, as a closer look at Tydeus' portrayal will show.

In the Epipolesis, the review of the Akhaian troops just before they join battle with the Trojan army, Agamemnon casts a *neikos*, a speech of blame, at Diomedes, accusing him of cowardice and a lack of eagerness to fight. These characteristics, Agamemnon asserts, make Diomedes unlike Tydeus (4.370-401):[13]

ὤ μοι Τυδέος υἱὲ δαίφρονος ἱπποδάμοιο
τί πτώσσεις, τί δ' ὀπιπεύεις πολέμοιο γεφύρας;
οὐ μὲν Τυδέϊ γ' ὧδε φίλον πτωσκαζέμεν ἦεν,
ἀλλὰ πολὺ πρὸ φίλων ἑτάρων δηίοισι μάχεσθαι,
ὡς φάσαν οἵ μιν ἴδοντο πονεύμενον· οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε
ἤντησ' οὐδὲ ἴδον· περὶ δ' ἄλλων φασὶ γενέσθαι.
ἤτοι μὲν γὰρ ἄτερ πολέμου εἰσῆλθε Μυκήνας
ξεῖνος ἅμ' ἀντιθέῳ Πολυνείκεϊ λαὸν ἀγείρων·
οἳ δὲ τότ' ἐστρατόωνθ' ἱερὰ πρὸς τείχεα Θήβης,
καί ῥα μάλα λίσσοντο δόμεν κλειτοὺς ἐπικούρους·
οἳ δ' ἔθελον δόμεναι καὶ ἐπήνεον ὡς ἐκέλευον·
ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς ἔτρεψε παραίσια σήματα φαίνων.
οἳ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ᾤχοντο ἰδὲ πρὸ ὁδοῦ ἐγένοντο,
Ἀσωπὸν δ' ἵκοντο βαθύσχοινον λεχεποίην,
ἔνθ' αὖτ' ἀγγελίην ἐπὶ Τυδῆ στεῖλαν Ἀχαιοί.
αὐτὰρ ὃ βῆ, πολέας δὲ κιχήσατο Καδμείωνας
δαινυμένους κατὰ δῶμα βίης Ἐτεοκληείης.
ἔνθ' οὐδὲ ξεῖνός περ ἐὼν ἱππηλάτα Τυδεὺς

13. On this speech see Alden (2000) 116-18. On *neikos* speeches in general see Adkins (1969) 7-10, 20-21; Alden (2000) 37-38; Martin (1989) 68-77; Nagy (1979) 222-42.

τάρβει, μοῦνος ἐὼν πολέσιν μετὰ Καδμείοισιν,
ἀλλ᾽ ὅ γ᾽ ἀεθλεύειν προκαλίζετο, πάντα δ᾽ ἐνίκα
ῥηϊδίως· τοίη οἱ ἐπίρροθος ἦεν Ἀθήνη.
οἳ δὲ χολωσάμενοι Καδμεῖοι κέντορες ἵππων
ἆψ ἄρ᾽ ἀνερχομένῳ πυκινὸν λόχον εἶσαν ἄγοντες
κούρους πεντήκοντα· δύω δ᾽ ἡγήτορες ἦσαν,
Μαίων Αἱμονίδης ἐπιείκελος ἀθανάτοισιν,
υἱός τ᾽ Αὐτοφόνοιο μενεπτόλεμος Πολυφόντης.
Τυδεὺς μὲν καὶ τοῖσιν ἀεικέα πότμον ἐφῆκε·
πάντας ἔπεφν᾽, ἕνα δ᾽ οἷον ἴει οἶκον δὲ νέεσθαι·
Μαίον᾽ ἄρα προέηκε θεῶν τεράεσσι πιθήσας.
τοῖος ἔην Τυδεὺς Αἰτώλιος· ἀλλὰ τὸν υἱὸν
γείνατο εἶο χέρεια μάχῃ, ἀγορῇ δέ τ᾽ ἀμείνω.

Ah me, son of Tydeus, skillful tamer of horses,
why do you shrink from the fray, why do you gaze at the ranks of war?
Not for Tydeus was it dear to shrink away thus,
but to fight the enemy far in front of his allies.
So they said who saw him toil; for I did not
meet or see him, but they say he excelled over the rest.
For indeed he came to Mycenae not to fight
but as a *xeinos* with godlike Polyneikos, when he was raising an army.
At that time they were campaigning against the holy walls of Thebes,
and they were entreating us to grant them glorious companions,
and the people were willing to give them, and they approved what was requested,
but Zeus turned their opinion, revealing ill-omened signs.
And when they were gone and were forward on their road,
and they had come to the grassy-banked Asopos, deep with rushes,
there the Akhaians dispatched Tydeus to bear their message.
And he went, and he came among the many Kadmeans,
feasting in the halls of mighty Eteokles.
Then, although he was a *xeinos*, the horseman Tydeus
did not fear, though he was alone among many Kadmeans,
but he challenged them to contests, and he won all,
easily: such a helper Athene was to him.
But the Kadmeans were angry, the goaders of horses,
and they went and set an ambush for him as he returned,
fifty youths. There were two leaders,
Maion the son of Haimon, like to the immortals,
and the son of Autophonos, staunch Polyphontes.
Tydeus sent an unseemly fate upon these too:

> he killed them all, and he sent only one to return home:
> for he sent back Maion, obeying the signs of the gods.
> Such was Tydeus, the Aitolian: but he begot a son
> worse than him in fighting, but better in speaking.

Agamemnon argues that Diomedes' current inaction is the polar opposite of Tydeus' habitual love of fighting far in advance of his companions (πολὺ πρὸ φίλων ἑτάρων, 4.372-73). Agamemnon presents this habit as a mark of bravery which Diomedes should emulate, but in another context fighting in advance of the front lines betrays a lack of caution which leads to destruction. When Akhilleus encounters Aineias in Book 20, he asks, "Aineias, why do you stand here, having come so far from the host?" (Αἰνεία τί σὺ τόσσον ὁμίλου πολλὸν ἐπελθὼν / ἔστης; 20.178-79) After a series of insults, including a recollection of a previous occasion on which Akhilleus defeated and nearly killed Aineias, Akhilleus urges Aineias to flee: "But I urge you to withdraw and go into the crowd, do not stand and face me, lest you suffer some evil..." (ἀλλά σ' ἔγωγ' ἀναχωρήσαντα κελεύω / ἐς πληθὺν ἰέναι, μηδ' ἀντίος ἵστασ' ἐμεῖο, πρίν τι κακὸν παθέειν, 20.197-98). Akhilleus draws a contrast between fighting in front of the battle lines and fighting as part of the crowd: for Aineias, safety lies in the crowd, but coming to meet Akhilleus in advance of the ranks means defeat. Akhilleus' words are accurate. In their subsequent duel Aineias is only saved from death by the intervention of Poseidon (20.318-39).

Agamemnon follows his characterization of Tydeus' boldness with an illustrative anecdote of his embassy to Thebes (4.382-97). Tydeus' habit of fighting in advance of his allies is at work in this story as well: even though he was a guest, and all alone, Tydeus challenged the youth of Thebes to athletic contests. Agamemnon emphasizes that he issues this challenge even

though he is alone among many Kadmeans (μοῦνος ἐὼν πολέσιν μετὰ Καδμείοισιν, / ἀλλ' ὅ γ' ἀεθλεύειν προκαλίζετο, 4.388-89). In Agamemnon's narrative, the athletic competition is a barely sublimated form of combat. A further indication of Tydeus' eagerness to fight is that he challenges the youths in spite of the fact that he is in the city as a *xeinos* (4.387), which makes participating in contests inappropriate and provocative. Chastened by his success, the Thebans set an ambush for Tydeus, bringing actual combat into the episode. Fighting alone, Tydeus inflicts a defeat so severe that he only one man is left alive to carry the tale back to Thebes (4.397-98). In Agamemnon's account, Tydeus' boldness leads to a signal success. Moreover, Tydeus is in the good graces of the gods: Athene is by his side (τοίη οἱ ἐπίρροθος ἦεν Ἀθήνη, 4.391) and he obeys the gods' signs (θεῶν τεράεσσι πιθήσας, 4.398). However, Agamemnon's account leaves out some details of Tydeus' story. Agamemnon says that he never met Tydeus (οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε / ἤντησ' οὐδὲ ἴδον, 4.374-75), which is perhaps an indication that the Akhaian leader has only partial knowledge of Tydeus' career.

Diomedes does not verbally respond to Agamemnon's *neikos*, but the indignant reply of his charioteer Sthenelos (4.404-10) supplies details about Tydeus that Agamemnon's speech lacks. According to Sthenelos, Tydeus and the others who attacked Thebes with him perished because of their own reckless acts (κεῖνοι δὲ σφετέρῃσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὄλοντο, 4.410). *Atasthalia* and its derivatives are used five times in the *Iliad*, twice in connection with an explicit mention of hybris.[14] Both of these uses of the noun *atasthalia* denote actions which result in destruction. As

14. 4.409, 11.695, 13.634, 22.104, 22.418. At 11.695 and 13.634 there is a close connection with a form of hybris.

Sthenelos says, the Seven destroy themselves (ὄλοντο, 4.410) but Hektor's recklessness destroys his people (ὤλεσα λαὸν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ἐμῇσιν, 22.104). *Atasthalia* is a more common word in the *Odyssey*, where it is used nine times, and is familiar from the proem (*Odyssey* 1.7) and Zeus' subsequent speech (*Odyssey* 1.34); in these two instances the word designates reckless actions which result in punishment by the gods. Sthenelos' negative characterization of the first attack on Thebes marks Diomedes' father and his own father as impious mortals who brought destruction on themselves by their own reckless actions. Sthenelos does not specify what these deeds were or how Tydeus perished. This is perhaps for reasons of propriety—Sthenelos has little reason to detail the inglorious fate of his father and Diomedes' father. Ancient audiences of the *Iliad* likely would have been familiar with poetic traditions about the Epigonoi, and so could have filled in the missing details. Apollodorus (3.6.8) supplies a detail that may go back to archaic traditions of Tydeus' fate: as Tydeus was dying from wounds he sustained in a battle with the Theban Melanippos, Athene came to him, intending to bestow immortality upon him. But when she saw him eating Melanippos' brains, she became disgusted and left him to die.[15] Sthenelos, then, exposes an inadvertent irony in Agamemnon's use of Tydeus as a paradigm for Diomedes. In urging Diomedes to act more like his father, Agamemnon in fact urges him to fight recklessly; if Diomedes were to emulate his father fully, he would finish his career by committing *atasthaliai*. Sthenelos' contrast of the Seven's failure to take Thebes and the Epigoni's success implies that the

15. Tydeus' loss of immortality is also found in a scholion to Pindar *Nemean* 10.12 (3.167-68 Drachmann) and scholion AbT on *Iliad* 5.126.

model he and Diomedes should follow is not that of their fathers, whom they have outdone by far; instead, they should emulate themselves, as they were when they sacked Thebes.

Athene's use of Tydeus as a paradigm reveals his problematic career more fully. Like Agamemnon, Athene brings up Tydeus in a rebuke. Diomedes has retreated, both because he is feeling the effects of the wound he received from Pandaros (5.796-98), and also because he recognizes that Ares is present on the battlefield, supporting the now successful Trojans (5.603-606). Athene has come to urge Diomedes to fight Ares, and rebukes him for not fighting. Her account follows the sequence of Agamemnon's narrative of Tydeus' embassy to Thebes closely, but she supplies details that were not present in his speech. She makes clear just how eager to fight Tydeus was (5.800-13):

ἦ ὀλίγον οἷ παῖδα ἐοικότα γείνατο Τυδεύς.
Τυδεύς τοι μικρὸς μὲν ἔην δέμας, ἀλλὰ μαχητής·
καί ῥ' ὅτε πέρ μιν ἐγὼ πολεμίζειν οὐκ εἴασκον
οὐδ' ἐκπαιφάσσειν, ὅτε τ' ἦλυθε νόσφιν Ἀχαιῶν
ἄγγελος ἐς Θήβας πολέας μετὰ Καδμείωνας·
δαίνυσθαί μιν ἄνωγον ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἔκηλον·
αὐτὰρ ὃ θυμὸν ἔχων ὃν καρτερὸν ὡς τὸ πάρος περ
κούρους Καδμείων προκαλίζετο, πάντα δ' ἐνίκα
ῥηϊδίως· τοίη οἱ ἐγὼν ἐπιτάρροθος ἦα.
σοὶ δ' ἤτοι μὲν ἐγὼ παρά θ' ἵσταμαι ἠδὲ φυλάσσω,
καί σε προφρονέως κέλομαι Τρώεσσι μάχεσθαι·
ἀλλά σευ ἢ κάματος πολυΐξ γυῖα δέδυκεν
ἦ νύ σέ που δέος ἴσχει ἀκήριον· οὐ σύ γ' ἔπειτα
Τυδέος ἔκγονός ἐσσι δαίφρονος Οἰνείδαο.

Indeed Tydeus fathered a son little like him.
Tydeus was short in stature, but he was a fighter:
even when I would not allow him to wage war
or rush into battle, when he came, apart from the Akhaians
as a messenger to Thebes among the many Kadmeans,
I ordered him to feast in the halls at leisure,
but, possessing a strong *thumos*, as always,

> he called out the youths of the Kadmeans, and he defeated them all,
> easily: such an ally I was for him.
> But even though I stand by you and guard you,
> and I willingly exhort you to fight the Trojans—
> either weariness from your many assaults has entered your limbs,
> or now spiritless fear stays you: and so you, at any rate
> are not the offspring of destructive-minded Tydeus, son of Oineios.

Athene makes it plain that Tydeus was not only too eager to fight, but disobeyed the direct commands of a god. She ordered him not to fight (5.802-803) but to feast at ease (ἔκηλον, 5.804) with the Thebans. Tydeus, however, had a strong *thumos*, and challenged the Theban youths. Athene collapses the athletic contests and the ambush together, recognizing that Tydeus' challenge is effectively as antagonistic as actual combat. Instead of being angry at Tydeus' disobedience, Athene seems to be proud. He won easily (ῥηϊδίως, 5.808) because she stood by him (τοίη οἱ ἐγὼν ἐπιτάρροθος ἦα, 5.808; compare in Agamemnon's speech τοίη οἱ ἐπίρροθος ἦεν Ἀθήνη, 4.390).

Athene presents Diomedes with the paradigm of an openly disobedient hero. Tydeus fought even when ordered not to, and yet she supported him. She also supports Diomedes: "But even though I stand by you and guard you" (σοὶ δ' ἤτοι μὲν ἐγὼ παρά θ' ἵσταμαι ἠδὲ φυλάσσω, 5.809). But even with this support, he does not fight. Therefore, he is no son of Tydeus. This is an internally consistent argument, but it has the effect of valorizing Tydeus' insubordination. Of course, in Athene's account, Diomedes is being disobedient by not fighting, for she has ordered him to attack the Trojans (καί σε προφρονέως κέλομαι Τρώεσσι μάχεσθαι, 5.809).

Diomedes reminds Athene of a more important injunction, her command that he was not to attack any gods except for Aphrodite (5.817-24):

οὔτέ τί με δέος ἴσχει ἀκήριον οὔτέ τις ὄκνος,
ἀλλ᾽ ἔτι σέων μέμνημαι ἐφετμέων ἃς ἐπέτειλας·
οὔ μ᾽ εἴας μακάρεσσι θεοῖς ἀντικρὺ μάχεσθαι
τοῖς ἄλλοις· ἀτὰρ εἴ κε Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἀφροδίτη
ἔλθῃσ᾽ ἐς πόλεμον, τήν γ᾽ οὐτάμεν ὀξέϊ χαλκῷ.
τοὔνεκα νῦν αὐτός τ᾽ ἀναχάζομαι ἠδὲ καὶ ἄλλους
Ἀργείους ἐκέλευσα ἀλήμεναι ἐνθάδε πάντας·
γιγνώσκω γὰρ Ἄρηα μάχην ἀνὰ κοιρανέοντα.

Not at all does spiritless fear hold me, nor some hesitation,
but still I remember your commands which you enjoined upon me.
You would not permit me to fight against the blessed gods,
the other ones; but if the daughter of Zeus, Aphrodite,
entered into battle, I was to wound her with the sharp spear.
For this reason now I myself am giving ground and likewise have ordered
all the other Argives to be gathered together here;
for I recognize Ares lording it over the battle.

Diomedes tactfully points out that Athene has selectively presented her orders, without actually saying so. Athene did urge him to fight the Trojans (5.124), but Diomedes says nothing about this command; rather, he concentrates on Athene's more crucial instruction not to fight any god but Aphrodite. Diomedes argues that he has been hanging back because he has sensed that Ares is fighting on the side of the Trojans. This is an accurate report of his earlier recommendation that the Akhaians flee in the face of Hektor and Ares (5.596-606). Even though he has been given Tydeus' *menos* (5.125), Diomedes' response ironically demonstrates the truth of Athene's rebuke that he is not like his father: whereas Tydeus disobeyed Athene's commands because of an eagerness to fight and "rush into battle" (5.805), Diomedes follows Athene's orders.

It is important to note that Athene's rebuke need not be taken at face value, nor do we need to see her as being genuinely vexed by Diomedes' current inaction.[16] Rather, Athene may

16. Fenik (1968: 76) sees Athene's speech as playful.

simply be rousing Diomedes' spirit before she infuses him with *menos* once more, or perhaps she is testing his obedience to her earlier orders not to fight with any god save Aphrodite; a response less prudent than the one Diomedes gives may well have met with a further rebuke. As it is, Athene seems pleased with Diomedes' response, and calls him "son of Tydeus" when she responds again, implicitly repudiating her earlier criticism that he is not his father's son: "Diomedes, son of Tydeus, most pleasing to my *thumos*...," (Τυδείδη Διόμηδες ἐμῷ κεχαρισμένε θυμῷ, 5.826). Whatever Athene's motive is in using Tydeus as a paradigm, her narrative still makes it clear that Tydeus did not restrain himself and challenged the Thebans to fight, contrary to Athene's commands. Diomedes makes a strong claim of fidelity to Athene's commands, but Athene has provided a vivid testimony to the possibility that Diomedes could end up committing reckless deeds: it is, as it were, his birthright. At this point in his *aristeia*, Diomedes has already come close to doing just that: the exchange between Diomedes and Athene comes some time after Diomedes' repeated attempts to attack Aineias as Apollo carries him from the battlefield (5.431-44).

Divine Strife

Thus far, I have focused on Diomedes' conduct, but his *aristeia* has a great deal to say about relations between the gods. In particular, the episode reveals how the divine community is divided by internal strife. It will therefore be helpful to follow the episode with a focus on the actions of Athene. The *aristeia* begins conventionally: Athene gives Diomedes *menos* and *tharsos*, so that he might win renown (5.2-3).[17] Diomedes is wounded by Pandaros (5.95-100); instead

17. On typical elements of the *aristeia*, see Arend (1933) 92-98, Schröter (1950), Fenik (1968),

of bringing an end to the *aristeia*,[18] this provides an opportunity for its renewal and amplification: Diomedes prays to Athene for aid, reminding her of her favor towards Tydeus (5.117-18). In response, Athene gives Diomedes relief from his wounds, and grants him the same *menos* that Tydeus had, as she says: "for I have put in your breast the *menos* of your father, untrembling, such as the shield-wielding horseman Tydeus always had" (ἐν γάρ τοι στήθεσσι μένος πατρώϊον ἧκα / ἄτρομον, οἷον ἔχεσκε σακέσπαλος ἱππότα Τυδεύς, 5.125-26). Athene also gives Diomedes the ability to discern gods from mortals, and orders him not to attack any immortal save Aphrodite. As we have seen, Tydeus did not obey Athene's orders, and Diomedes now possesses the *menos* of his disobedient father. The combination of this *menos* with Athene's prohibition sets up the potential that Diomedes will disobey orders and go beyond attacking Aphrodite.

Diomedes, with *menos* three times as great as before (5.136), reenters the battle, and immediately kills four pairs of Trojans; this catches the attention of Aineias, who persuades Pandaros to attack Diomedes along with him.[19] Pandaros is slain and Aineias wounded, which brings his mother onto the battlefield to rescue him. Diomedes quickly wounds her (5.330-43). She drops Aineias, who is caught up and concealed by Apollo (5.344-46); Diomedes then taunts Aphrodite in the same way victorious warriors taunt mortal victims (5.347-51).[20] The rapidity with which Aphrodite is wounded and retreats does not satisfy the expectations created by Diomedes' exploits so far; a greater exploit is needed for a fitting conclusion to his *aristeia*. But

---

Krischer (1971), and Thornton (1984) 74-82. For Diomedes' *aristeia*, see Schröter (1950) 35-39, Fenik (1968) 9-77 and Krischer (1971) 24-27.
18. On wounding as a conventional trigger for the end of an *aristeia* see Nagy (1979) 31.
19. On the "consultation pattern" that forms the structure of 5.166-448 see Fenik (1968) 24-27.
20. Fenik (1968) 40-41.

this must wait for a long interlude, as Aphrodite retreats. She finds Ares sitting to the left of the battle (μάχης ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ, 5.355), and complains that Diomedes would now fight even with Zeus (5.361-62):

> λίην ἄχθομαι ἕλκος ὅ με βροτὸς οὔτασεν ἀνὴρ
> Τυδείδης, ὃς νῦν γε καὶ ἂν Διὶ πατρὶ μάχοιτο.
>
> I am excessively pained by a wound that a mortal man dealt me,
> the son of Tydeus, who would now fight even with father Zeus.

Aphrodite continues to treat the attack upon her as an attack against the gods in general after she has reached Olympus and thrown herself at the knees of her mother Dione, who at first assumes that another god has caused the wound (5.373-74). Aphrodite corrects her: Diomedes is responsible for her wound, and this means that the war is no longer between mortals, but the Greeks are fighting with the immortals (5.379-80):

> οὐ γὰρ ἔτι Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν φύλοπις αἰνή,
> ἀλλ' ἤδη Δαναοί γε καὶ ἀθανάτοισι μάχονται.
>
> For no longer is the dread battle between Trojans and Akhaians,
> but now the Danaans at least battle even the immortals.

Aphrodite portrays Diomedes' attack as an affront directed against not only her but also at the gods as a group. She expresses this thought in two ways. First, she says that Diomedes would fight even with Zeus (5.361-62); that is, an attack on an immortal by a mortal expresses that mortal's willingness to attack Zeus. This is simultaneously a metaphysical and a political statement. Zeus is at the apex of the hierarchy of power among gods and mortals; to fight with a god is to disregard the wide gap in status between mortal and immortal, and to therefore threaten to erase that distinction. Aphrodite then magnifies the scope of the problem: Diomedes' community, the Danaans, is attacking the community of the gods (5.379-80).

The notion that an attack on an individual god equals an attack on the gods as a group assumes a certain level of divine solidarity that is lacking in the *Iliad*. Instead, there is division and open strife, as Dione points out almost immediately. Dione's consolation agrees with Aphrodite's complaint as far as the illegitimacy of mortals attacking gods. But Dione contradicts Aphrodite's picture of group solidarity, and instead lists examples of mortals wounding gods that make these acts part of a history of strife among the gods (5.382-415):

τέτλαθι τέκνον ἐμόν, καὶ ἀνάσχεο κηδομένη περ·
πολλοὶ γὰρ δὴ τλῆμεν Ὀλύμπια δώματ᾽ ἔχοντες
ἐξ ἀνδρῶν χαλέπ᾽ ἄλγε᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἀλλήλοισι τιθέντες.
τλῆ μὲν Ἄρης ὅτε μιν Ὦτος κρατερός τ᾽ Ἐφιάλτης
παῖδες Ἀλωῆος, δῆσαν κρατερῷ ἐνὶ δεσμῷ·
χαλκέῳ δ᾽ ἐν κεράμῳ δέδετο τρισκαίδεκα μῆνας·
καί νύ κεν ἔνθ᾽ ἀπόλοιτο Ἄρης ἄτος πολέμοιο,
εἰ μὴ μητρυιὴ περικαλλὴς Ἠερίβοια
Ἑρμέᾳ ἐξήγγειλεν· ὃ δ᾽ ἐξέκλεψεν Ἄρηα
ἤδη τειρόμενον, χαλεπὸς δέ ἑ δεσμὸς ἐδάμνα.
τλῆ δ᾽ Ἥρη, ὅτε μιν κρατερὸς πάϊς Ἀμφιτρύωνος
δεξιτερὸν κατὰ μαζὸν ὀϊστῷ τριγλώχινι
βεβλήκει· τότε καί μιν ἀνήκεστον λάβεν ἄλγος.
τλῆ δ᾽ Ἀίδης ἐν τοῖσι πελώριος ὠκὺν ὀϊστόν,
εὖτέ μιν ὠὐτὸς ἀνὴρ υἱὸς Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο
ἐν Πύλῳ ἐν νεκύεσσι βαλὼν ὀδύνῃσιν ἔδωκεν·
αὐτὰρ ὃ βῆ πρὸς δῶμα Διὸς καὶ μακρὸν Ὄλυμπον
κῆρ ἀχέων ὀδύνῃσι πεπαρμένος· αὐτὰρ ὀϊστὸς
ὤμῳ ἔνι στιβαρῷ ἠλήλατο, κῆδε δὲ θυμόν.
τῷ δ᾽ ἐπὶ Παιήων ὀδυνήφατα φάρμακα πάσσων
ἠκέσατ᾽· οὐ μὲν γάρ τι καταθνητός γε τέτυκτο.
σχέτλιος ὀβριμοεργὸς ὃς οὐκ ὄθετ᾽ αἴσυλα ῥέζων,
ὃς τόξοισιν ἔκηδε θεοὺς οἳ Ὄλυμπον ἔχουσι.
σοὶ δ᾽ ἐπὶ τοῦτον ἀνῆκε θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη·
νήπιος, οὐδὲ τὸ οἶδε κατὰ φρένα Τυδέος υἱὸς
ὅττι μάλ᾽ οὐ δηναιὸς ὃς ἀθανάτοισι μάχηται,
οὐδέ τί μιν παῖδες ποτὶ γούνασι παππάζουσιν
ἐλθόντ᾽ ἐκ πολέμοιο καὶ αἰνῆς δηϊοτῆτος.
τὼ νῦν Τυδείδης, εἰ καὶ μάλα καρτερός ἐστι,

φραζέσθω μή τίς οἱ ἀμείνων σεῖο μάχηται,
μὴ δὴν Αἰγιάλεια περίφρων Ἀδρηστίνη
ἐξ ὕπνου γοόωσα φίλους οἰκῆας ἐγείρῃ
κουρίδιον ποθέουσα πόσιν τὸν ἄριστον Ἀχαιῶν
ἰφθίμη ἄλοχος Διομήδεος ἱπποδάμοιο. 415

Endure, my child, and bear up though grieving,
for in fact many of us with Olympian homes have endured,
as we set harsh suffering on each other through humans.
Ares suffered, when Otos and mighty Ephialtes,
the sons of Aloeus, bound him with a mighty chain:
and he was bound in a bronze jar for thirteen months,
and then Ares, insatiate of war, would have perished,
if their stepmother, beautiful Eeriboia,
had not told Hermes: but he freed Ares,
already wasting away, and the harsh bonds were breaking him.
And Hera endured, when the mighty child of Amphitryon
struck her in the right breast with a triple-barbed arrow:
and then incurable pain seized her also.
And along with them giant Hades endured a swift arrow,
when the same man, the son of aegis-bearing Zeus,
striking him in Pylos among the dead gave him over to pain:
and he went to the halls of Zeus and lofty Olympos
grieving in his heart, pierced with pains: but the arrow
had been driven into his thick shoulder, and pained his *thumos*.
But Paieon cured him, sprinkling pain-killing drugs:
for he was not at all born a mortal.
Pitiless man, worker of violence, who did not shrink from doing impious deeds,
who pained with arrows the gods who hold Olympos.
The goddess, grey-eyed Athene, urged this man against you:
the fool, the son of Tydeus does not know this in his wits,
that the man who fights with the immortals is not long-lived,
nor do his children call him papa at his knees
when he comes from war and the dread battle.
So now let the son of Tydeus, even if he is very mighty,
take thought lest someone better than you fight with him,
lest Aigialeia, the wise daughter of Adrastos,
the noble wife of Diomedes, breaker of horses,
rouse her dear servants from sleep with her weeping.

Dione recognizes that Diomedes is acting at the instigation of Athene. Aphrodite's suffering, like the suffering of Ares, Hera, and Hades, is caused by a mortal, but these incidents occur because a god urges that mortal on. The god is as much an agent of the wounding as the mortal. These incidents are therefore instances of strife among the gods (ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισι, 5.384). Dione's perspective can be enlarged from individual instances of mortals wounding gods to the entire conflict which motivates them; just as Diomedes' feat can be seen as the latest development in a history of conflict among the gods, the Trojan War as a whole can be seen as a chapter in the unfolding story of divine strife. That Diomedes is taking part in a cosmic drama whose outlines he does not know in no way excuses his actions; as Dione's elaborate threat (5.406-15) shows, she either expects or hopes that Diomedes will suffer because of his actions.

Dione's first example of a god who suffered at the hands of a mortal is Ares, who was imprisoned in a bronze jar by Otos and Ephialtes. This is an otherwise unattested episode.[21] The *Odyssey* reports a different tradition about the Aloadai (*Odyssey* 11.305-20): they grew to a prodigious size when very young, and they promised to storm heaven by piling the mountains Olympos, Ossa, and Pelion on top of each other. Apollo killed them before they reached maturity, preventing them from fulfilling their intention.[22] In their attempt to storm heaven and presumably overthrow Zeus these monstrous children are like the Titans and Typhoeus, and similar to Ullikummi and the other monsters created as rebels against the Storm God in the

21. Scholion bT on *Odyssey* 11.305-20 reports that Ares' captivity was in revenge for his slaying of Adonis, who was entrusted to Otos and Ephialtes' guardianship by Aphrodite.
22. Otos and Ephialtes also appear in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (frr. 19-21 M-W).

Hurrian/Hittite tradition.[23] It is unclear whether these two stories are part of a larger narrative of the exploits of the Aloadai, or they reflect different and incompatible traditions. But both stories make the same essential point: the Aloadai presumptuously attack a god. Both stories have a connection to the succession myth. The *Odyssey* explicitly says that the Aloadai are sons of Poseidon (*Odyssey* 11.305-308). As was the case with Typhoeus, Zeus is challenged by a son of another god, but we can still recognize this as a modified version of the succession myth. The background of Dione's story is obscure, but in its insistence that the Aloadai bound Ares (δῆσαν κρατερῷ ἐνὶ δεσμῷ, 5.386; δέδετο, 5.387) we can see that the succession myth lies in the background of this story also. Slatkin has demonstrated that Iliadic occurrences of the motif of binding echo the *Theogony*, where binding plays a fundamental role in the succession of heavenly rule.[24] Another connection to Hesiod's account is the bronze jar that holds Ares, which has an interesting resemblance to the *deirē* of Tartaros where the Titans are imprisoned (*Theogony* 726-31).[25] The context of Ares' binding is unfortunately unclear: were the Aloadai assisting another god (perhaps Poseidon?) in the same fashion as the hundred-handers assisted Zeus by binding the Titans?

Despite her earlier emphasis on divine strife, Dione does not mention which god supported the Aloadai. This is also the case with Dione's other examples, Hera and Hades, who are both wounded by Herakles. It seems likely, however, that Athene, who was a constant helper

23. A point made by Kirk (1990) on 5.385-87.
24. Slatkin (1991) 66-69. See also Lang (1983) 157-60 on binding in the *Iliad*. Other Iliadic occurrences of binding are at 1.401-405, 15.19-20, 13.17ff.
25. Detienne and Vernant (1974) 86-98.

of Herakles (8.362-65), was encouraging him on these occasions also. Like the story about Otos and Ephialtes, this is the only attested version of these incidents. It is unclear if Hera and Hades were wounded in the same incident or in separate episodes of Herakles' career. The scholia reflect an ancient dispute on this point.[26] One possibility found in the scholia is that the reference is to Herakles' sack of Pylos (referred to by Nestor at 11.690-93), in which Poseidon, Hera, and Hades supported the Pylians.[27] This situation is quite similar to the *Iliad*; simply replace Hades with Athene for the coalition of gods supporting the Greeks. Even if this is not the exact situation envisioned by Dione, the wounding of Hera and Hades illustrates more clearly than the binding of Ares that incidents of mortals wounding gods are ultimately motivated by divine strife.

Divine *Kertomia*

Dione's examples connect Aphrodite's wounding with a past of divine strife. After Dione has finished her threat against Diomedes, Hera and Athene provide evidence of ongoing divine strife in the present: they both "attempt to provoke Zeus with mocking words" (κερτομίοις ἐπέεσσι Δία Κρονίδην ἐρέθιζον, 5.419). Only Athene's words are reported (5.420-25):

> τοῖσι δὲ μύθων ἦρχε θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη·
> Ζεῦ πάτερ ἦ ῥά τί μοι κεχολώσεαι ὅττι κεν εἴπω;
> ἦ μάλα δή τινα Κύπρις Ἀχαιϊάδων ἀνιεῖσα
> Τρωσὶν ἅμα σπέσθαι, τοὺς νῦν ἔκπαγλα φίλησε,
> τῶν τινα καρρέζουσα Ἀχαιϊάδων ἐϋπέπλων
> πρὸς χρυσῆ περόνῃ καταμύξατο χεῖρα ἀραιήν.
>
> And to them the goddess grey-eyed Athene began speaking:
> "Father Zeus, will you be at all angry with me if I say something?

26. See scholion bT on *Iliad* 5.392-400, and also the scholia bT on *Iliad* 5.392-94, 395-97.
27. Scholion bT on *Iliad* 5.392-94. For the gods' support of the Pylians see scholion D on *Iliad* 11.690.

> Certainly Kypris, urging on one of the Akhaian women
> to follow the Trojans whom she now exceedingly loves,
> caressing some one of the finely clothed Akhaian women,
> has scratched her slender hand on a golden brooch."

The expression I have translated as "mocking words" (κερτομίοις ἐπέεσσι) belongs to a family of terms that all share the κερτομ- root. The meaning and implication of these terms have been actively debated in recent scholarship, often with the aim of elucidating the scene in Book 24 where a speech of Akhilleus addressed to Priam is introduced with the participle ἐπικερτομέων (24.469).[28] Two recent approaches to the question, those of Michael Lloyd and Alex Gottesman, have drawn upon the methods of sociolinguistics to understand the κερτομ- terms as denoting a particular type of verbal activity, or as Gottesman puts it, "genre of speech," which they refer to with the term *kertomia*.[29]

Gottesman's treatment of *kertomia* is, in my opinion, the most successful to date. He sets out several characteristics of *kertomia*.[30] I will briefly outline these features and discuss how they are illustrated in Athene's speech; this will demonstrate that Athene's words are evidence of strife among the gods. In brief, then, Gottesman suggests that *kertomia* corresponded to a type of speech known to the Homeric audience from everyday life, associated with young men and symposia. Athene is not a young man, nor is the scene on Olympos in Book 5 marked as a symposium, but Gottesman's point is that *kertomia* is marked as a "masculine and youthful" speech genre. Speakers who perform *kertomia* are acting like young men at a symposium, and are

---

28. See Rose (1969), Nagy (1979) 261n6, Hooker (1986), Jones (1989), Clay (1999b), Lloyd (2004), Gottesman (2008).
29. For the concept of "speech genre", see Bakhtin (1986) 60-102.
30. The following characteristics of *kertomia* are summarized at Gottesman (2008) 11.

thus speaking in a manner at home in an agonistic setting. Little wonder, then, that another characteristic of *kertomia* is that it makes an implicit claim about the speaker's status at the expense of the addressee, the target, or both. Further, *kertomia* is indirect: it is addressed to one party, but targeted at another. Finally, *kertomia* can be playful, or hostile, or a mixture of the two.

Athene's speech has all of these features. It is playful and humorous, but also hostile: the humor comes from adding insult to the injury Aphrodite has already received. It is indirect: the introduction to Athene's speech indicates that she addresses the group of assembled gods (τοῖσι δὲ μύθων ἦρχε, 5.420), and she begins by addressing a question directly to Zeus (Ζεῦ πάτερ, 5.421). But the speech is aimed at making Aphrodite an object of laughter. The speech drives home a point that has already been made clear by the action of the poem, that Aphrodite is no warrior and has no place on the battlefield. Athene pretends not to know how Aphrodite received her wound, and instead imagines an un-martial context for the injury. The woman whom Aphrodite has urged to follow the Trojans is clearly a reference to Helen. Thus, Athene's speech implies that Aphrodite herself is at fault for her wound, because in making Helen follow along with Paris, Aphrodite set in motion the chain of events that led to her wounding. Not only is Aphrodite out of place on the battlefield, but an action within her sphere of influence has backfired upon her.

Athene's *kertomia* is thus an implicit assertion of her superiority to Aphrodite on the battlefield; since martial prowess is central to Iliadic ideas of status, this is also a claim of superiority within the divine hierarchy. This assertion is all the more cutting because Aphrodite's defeat comes at the hands of Diomedes. Athene's speech performs the boasting over a fallen

enemy that might have been expected from Athene's protégé. That Athene engages in behavior like that of a hero on the battlefield indicates that like the heroes with whom they are entangled, the gods compete with one another for honor. Seth Schein has said that the ethical values of the gods, "including their obsession with 'honor' (*timē*), are identical with those of humans."[31] But, he continues, since the gods are immortal, their gains or losses of honor are trivial in comparison with those of human beings. This, I think, does not do justice to the intensity of the gods' competition, nor does it take into account the possibility that the gods can be deprived of their *timai* through exclusion from the divine order, as the Titans are excluded from the Olympian order by imprisonment and binding in Tartaros. The gods' concern with honor is serious, then, and it contributes to ongoing strife, particularly when the gods attempt to requite past losses. Athene's allusion to Helen inevitably recalls the Judgment of Paris and the hostility of Athene and Hera against Aphrodite after her victory in that contest.[32] Athene's *kertomia* repays that past offense, but at the same time, extends the hostility between the goddesses.

In response to Athene, Zeus smiles (μείδησεν, 5.426) and then prohibits Aphrodite from further deeds of war (οὔ τοι τέκνον ἐμὸν δέδοται πολεμήϊα ἔργα, 5.427). Athene's aim, apparently, has been to instigate Zeus to prevent Aphrodite's return to the battlefield.[33] This highlights a feature of *kertomia* that Gottesman does not emphasize, that it can be, as Jenny Strauss Clay has put it, "a subtle way of manipulating someone to do what you want him to do without explicitly

31. Schein (1984) 53.
32. See Kirk (1985) on 5.422-25.
33. See Hooker (1986) 34.

saying so."[34] Zeus' prohibition means that Aphrodite and Athene will have little opportunity to engage in further strife in the near future, at least if they obey his strictures. At the same time, Zeus sets up a potential conflict between Athene and Ares: war is to be their concern (ταῦτα δ' Ἄρηϊ θοῷ καὶ Ἀθήνῃ πάντα μελήσει, 5.430, with ταῦτα... πάντα referring back to πολεμήϊα ἔργα). Divine conflict, in other words, is to continue, and will do so as Diomedes' *aristeia* proceeds.

Diomedes and Apollo

Further divine conflict, however, must wait as Diomedes' reckless attempts to kill Aineias, who is being carried away from the battlefield by Apollo, nearly lead to his destruction. Immediately after the scene on Olympos ends, the scene shifts back to Diomedes. Apollo is carrying Aineias from the battlefield, and Diomedes is in pursuit (5.432-35):

> Αἰνείᾳ δ' ἐπόρουσε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης,
> γιγνώσκων ὅ οἱ αὐτὸς ὑπείρεχε χεῖρας Ἀπόλλων·
> ἀλλ' ὅ γ' ἄρ' οὐδὲ θεὸν μέγαν ἄζετο, ἵετο δ' αἰεὶ
> Αἰνείαν κτεῖναι καὶ ἀπὸ κλυτὰ τεύχεα δῦσαι.
>
> Diomedes, good at the war-cry, rushed at Aineias,
> though he knew that Apollo himself held his arms over him:
> but he did not reverence the great god, and was ever wishing
> to kill Aineias and strip his glorious armor.

Diomedes knows that Apollo is protecting Aineias, since he still has the ability to discern gods from mortals granted to him by Athene. His persistence in going after Aineias, which is equivalent to attacking Apollo, is marked out in the narratorial voice as disrespect (οὐδὲ… ἄζετο, 5.434). Diomedes tries three times to attack Aineias, and three times Apollo pushes him back;

34. Clay (1999b) 621.

when Diomedes tries to attack for a fourth time, "equal to a *daimon*" (δαίμονι ἶσος, 5.438) Apollo warns him off (5.440-44):[35]

> φράζεο, Τυδείδη καὶ χάζεο, μηδὲ θεοῖσιν
> ἶσ' ἔθελε φρονέειν, ἐπεὶ οὔ ποτε φῦλον ὁμοῖον
> ἀθανάτων τε θεῶν χαμαὶ ἐρχομένων τ' ἀνθρώπων.
> ὣς φάτο, Τυδείδης δ' ἀνεχάζετο τυτθὸν ὀπίσσω
> μῆνιν ἀλευάμενος ἑκατηβόλου Ἀπόλλωνος.
>
> "Consider, son of Tydeus, and withdraw, and do not
> wish to think like the gods, since not at all alike are the race
> of immortal gods and the race of men who walk on the earth."
> So he spoke, and the son of Tydeus gave way, a little bit,
> evading the *mēnis* of far-shooting Apollo.

By backing off "a little bit" (τυτθὸν, 5.443), Diomedes avoids Apollo's *mēnis*. Leonard Muellner has demonstrated that *mēnis* is activated is when social hierarchy is under threat, and Diomedes' triple attack on Aineias/Apollo is exactly such an occasion.[36] Apollo's speech draws a firm distinction between mortals and gods, which Diomedes is not respecting. The narrator's statement that Diomedes rushes on Aineias δαίμονι ἶσος (5.438) is not a casual simile, but points in the same direction as Apollo's command, "do not wish to think like the gods" (μηδὲ θεοῖσιν / ἶσ' ἔθελε φρονέειν, 5.440-41). Diomedes ceases his attack, and thereby avoids becoming a casualty of his own *atasthalia*, but we can see clearly that he has gone beyond Athene's commands, and has restrained himself only with difficulty.

The pattern of attacking "three times" and stopping on the fourth (τρὶς μὲν...τρὶς δέ...ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ τὸ τέταρτον ἐπέσσυτο δαίμονι ἶσος), occurs four times in the *Iliad*: once here with

35. On the "three times" motif, see Willcock (1995) 119-20.
36. See Muellner (1996) 50-51.

Diomedes, twice with Patroklos (16.702-706, 784-86), and once with Akhilleus (20.455-59). In each passage Apollo is an antagonist, though he is not the primary target of the attack. As Muellner has shown, the passages in which Patroklos attacks three times raise the same issue as Diomedes' attack on Aineias: by acting δαίμονι ἴσος the hero threatens the hierarchical differentiation of gods and men; this is also the case with Akhilleus' triple attack (20.455-59).[37] A passage in Book 8, in which Diomedes hesitates to retreat in the face of several unfavorable omens from Zeus, bears comparison to these triple attacks.[38] A brief digression on this passage will be instructive about the nature of the "three times" pattern and reinforce my argument that Diomedes has his father's capacity for reckless deeds.

Diomedes' triple attempt comes on the second day of full battle. Zeus has turned the course of battle towards Trojan victory with a thunderclap and a flash of lightning (8.75-77). The Akhaians retreat, except for Nestor, who is hindered because his trace horse has been killed. Nestor must cut the horse free from its traces, and because of the delay this causes, he is in danger of being killed, but Diomedes "sharply notices" him: (ὀξὺ νόησε, 8.90-91). Diomedes' immediate action upon noticing Nestor is to rebuke Odysseus for retreating and to urge him to stand his ground and defend Nestor. Odysseus, however, does not hear (or does not listen to: οὐδ' ἐσάκουσε, 8.97) him, and keeps on retreating. Diomedes is left alone to mix with the Trojan *promachoi*: (Τυδείδης δ' αὐτός περ ἐὼν προμάχοισιν ἐμίχθη, 8.99). "Mix[ing] with the front

37. Muellner (1996) 14-18. See also Fenik (1968) 46-48 on the similarities between these triple attacks.
38. On this passage see Cook (2009).

fighters" (προμάχοισιν ἐμίχθη) is a conventional way of indicating a hero's eagerness to fight, as a passage from Diomedes' *aristeia* indicates (5.134-36):[39]

> Τυδείδης δ' ἐξαῦτις ἰὼν προμάχοισιν ἐμίχθη
> καὶ πρίν περ θυμῷ μεμαὼς Τρώεσσι μάχεσθαι,
> δὴ τότε μιν τρὶς τόσσον ἔλεν μένος ὥς τε λέοντα
>
> and the son of Tydeus went back again and mixed with the front fighters,
> and though before he had been eager in his *thumos* to fight with the Trojans,
> indeed now *menos* three times as great took hold of him, like a lion...

The mention of *promachoi* in Book 8 has struck some commentators as inappropriate; since Diomedes has remained behind an Akhaian retreat, there are no "front fighters."[40] The inconsistency, if it is that, is slight: although there are no front fighters on the Greek side, all of the pursuing Trojans could be referred to as *promachoi*, and the approaching Hektor certainly is. Even though this situation is not the result of advancing before his comrades, but remaining behind them, the result is effectively the same as if Diomedes had advanced to the front: he is alone among the front fighters, a tactical position that Tydeus loved.

Diomedes' rescue of Nestor quickly leads to a dangerous situation which raises the possibility of reckless actions. Nestor is easily rescued, and replaces Sthenelos as Diomedes' charioteer. Instead of retreating in accordance with Zeus' earlier sign, the pair advance on Hektor (8.117). With his first spear-cast, Diomedes kills Hektor's charioteer, Thebaios, and Hektor retreats (8.119-29). Diomedes is on the verge of even greater success (8.130-32):

---

39. Other instances of προμάχοισιν ἐμίχθη are at 13.642 and 15.457.
40. e.g., Kirk (1985) on 8.99-100.

ἔνθά κε λοιγὸς ἔην καὶ ἀμήχανα ἔργα γένοντο,
καί νύ κε σήκασθεν κατὰ Ἴλιον ἠύτε ἄρνες,
εἰ μὴ ἄρ᾽ ὀξὺ νόησε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε.

Then there would have been devastation and deeds beyond repair,
and the Trojans would have been penned in Ilion like sheep,
if the father of men and gods had not noticed sharply.

Diomedes seems to be on the verge of beginning a new *aristeia*, but Zeus hurls a thunderbolt in front of his horses (8.133-34).[41] Nestor recognizes this as a clear sign that they should retreat. This is no great feat of interpretation, but understanding the meaning of the portent is even more urgent given that it intensifies the earlier omen which had already inspired a general retreat; Diomedes and Nestor have already been disobeying a clearly expressed divine sign. Diomedes acknowledges that Nestor's interpretation of the sign is proper, but he resists withdrawing, because he feels grief (ἄχος, 8.147) over Hektor's future boasts (8.146-50).[42] Hektor makes such a boast almost immediately (8.161-66), and Diomedes contemplates turning his chariot and attacking Hektor. This deliberation is described in an unusual version of a *mermerizein*-scene (8.167-71):[43]

ὣς φάτο, Τυδείδης δὲ διάνδιχα μερμήριξεν
ἵππους τε στρέψαι καὶ ἐναντίβιον μαχέσασθαι.
τρὶς μὲν μερμήριξε κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν,
τρὶς δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἀπ᾽ Ἰδαίων ὀρέων κτύπε μητίετα Ζεὺς
σῆμα τιθεὶς Τρώεσσι μάχης ἑτεραλκέα νίκην.

41. Fenik (1968) 222 notes that this is the only instance of Zeus hurling a thunderbolt in front of a warrior's horses in the *Iliad*; Zeus earlier throws a thunderbolt into the Akhaian army (8.75), which is also unparalleled.
42. For discussion of 8.124-50 as a sequence of two *akhos*-scenes see Cook (2003).
43. On *mermerizein* scenes, see Arend (1933) 105–15, Pucci (1987) 66–75. On the relationship of *mermerizein* scenes and *akhos*, see Cook (2003) 191-92.

So he spoke, and the son of Tydeus considered with divided mind
to turn his horses and fight face to face.
Three times he pondered in his wits and *thumos*
and three times crafty Zeus thundered from the Idaian mountains,
giving a sign to the Trojans of a victory that would turn the tide of battle.

A nearly unique feature of this scene is that Diomedes considers a single course of action, whereas these scenes usually feature deliberation between a pair of possible actions, introduced by "whether...or..." (ἤ...ἤ). It is not completely unparalleled to contemplate a single action: at 14.159-60 Hera deliberates how she might trick Zeus (μερμήριξε...ὅππως ἐξαπάφοιτο Διὸς νόον αἰγιόχοιο). In every other case where someone is said to deliberate with divided mind (διάνδιχα μερμήριξεν, e.g. 1.189, 8.167), both possible actions are given. In Diomedes' deliberation, however, the alternative course of action is easily deduced: either Diomedes will turn his horses and fight Hektor, or he will follow Nestor's advice (8.139-44) and withdraw.

A more unusual feature is that Diomedes considers "three times" (τρὶς μὲν, 8.169). This is strange both because in other *mermerizein*-scenes the deliberation is not repeated, and because other instances of the "three times" motif involve physical action, usually attacks of some sort.[44] In response to Diomedes' triple deliberation, Zeus thunders three times from Ida, reinforcing the signs he has already given. It is made triply plain that Diomedes is disregarding Zeus' clearly expressed will. There is no fourth deliberation, and indeed no further word about Diomedes. Instead, Hektor cries triumphantly to the Trojans that Zeus has given them victory (8.173-84), and Diomedes is forgotten until he initiates a counterattack (8.253); we do not witness his decision to retreat in accordance with the sign of Zeus. This absence is pointed. In other

44. See Kirk (1985) on 8.99-100.

instances when a hero attempts an action "three times," his fourth attempt fails, and the failure sometimes results in the hero's death. After Patroklos attacks the walls of Troy three times, on the fourth attempt Apollo knocks him senseless (16.786-92) and he is killed by Hektor (16.818-28) The "three times" pattern thus sets up the expectation of Diomedes' death by thunderbolt. Instead, his retreat is erased by Hektor's cry of triumph, effectively giving the Trojan warrior the last word.

With his multiple assaults on Aineias, Diomedes emulates his father's history of reckless deeds and nearly undergoes his father's fate of destruction by his own *atasthalia*. The "three times" pattern found in this passage both raises expectations of Diomedes' destruction and also emphasizes that it is with great difficulty that he stops himself from committing fatal *atasthalia*. The recurrence of the "three times" motif in Book 8 shows that Diomedes' recklessness is not a momentary lapse caused by his battle frenzy, but an ingrained trait. The attacks on Aineias are transgressive because Diomedes acts as an equal to Apollo, who is protecting Aineias from harm; the difference between mortal and immortal must be respected, as the god himself points out. Ironically, the ability to perceive the gods has led to the occlusion of Diomedes' perception of the essential difference between gods and men; it is only with a firm warning from one of the gods that Diomedes is able to save himself from disaster.

The Wounding of Ares and the *Aristeia* of Athene

Circumstances are different in Diomedes' third confrontation with a god. As Diomedes goes forth to meet Ares, Athene is by his side; the goddess shapes and controls the action to such an extent that Diomedes becomes her surrogate. This does not excuse him from a charge of

atasthalia, but the presence and control of the goddess means that the theme of reckless mortal behavior fades before the theme of strife between the gods. Athene will become so involved in the action that she guides Diomedes' spear into Ares' belly as she has an *aristeia* of her own. This is not yet open combat between gods, as Athene is invisible during the encounter. Nevertheless, the episode not only illustrates Dione's point that mortals wound gods when immortals are at odds with each other, but also suggests that such occasions bring the gods closer to open conflict with each other.

It will be helpful to recap the events leading up to Diomedes' confrontation with Ares. A few lines after Diomedes' attacks on Aineias, Apollo urges Ares to enter battle by complaining about Diomedes in words that echo Aphrodite's (5.455-59):

> Ἄρες Ἄρες βροτολοιγὲ μιαιφόνε τειχεσιπλῆτα,
> οὐκ ἂν δὴ τόνδ' ἄνδρα μάχης ἐρύσαιο μετελθὼν
> Τυδεΐδην, ὅς νῦν γε καὶ ἂν Διὶ πατρὶ μάχοιτο;
> Κύπριδα μὲν πρῶτα σχεδὸν οὔτασε χεῖρ' ἐπὶ καρπῷ,
> αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ' αὐτῷ μοι ἐπέσσυτο δαίμονι ἶσος.
>
> Ares, Ares, mortal-destroyer, defiled-slaughterer, wall-stormer,
> won't you go after this man and drag him from battle,
> the son of Tydeus, who now would fight even with father Zeus?
> First he wounded Kypris at close quarters on the hand at the wrist,
> and then, equal to a daimon, he even rushed at me!

Apollo repeats exactly Aphrodite's worry, also addressed to Ares, that Diomedes is willing to fight even with Zeus (Τυδείδην, ὅς νῦν γε καὶ ἂν Διὶ πατρὶ μάχοιτο, 5.362, 457). He also echoes the narrator's description of Diomedes rushing on him "equal to a *daimon*" (δαίμονι ἶσος, 5.459). Interestingly, he leaves out the element of divine strife which is so prominent in Dione's speech; instead, his appeal for Ares to enter battle is based on Diomedes' presumption in attacking gods.

Apollo's speech lays the groundwork for a confrontation between Diomedes and Ares, one in which Diomedes will again go beyond proper mortal behavior but in the end will be "dragged from battle" (μάχης ἐρύσαιο) by Ares.

But Diomedes does not face Ares for some time. After Apollo's speech, Diomedes is not seen for some eighty lines. When he does reappear, he sees Ares ranging around Hektor, and gives way. His retreat is described in a river simile (5.597-600):

> ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἀνὴρ ἀπάλαμνος ἰὼν πολέος πεδίοιο
> στήῃ ἐπ' ὠκυρόῳ ποταμῷ ἅλα δὲ προρέοντι
> ἀφρῷ μορμύροντα ἰδών, ἀνά τ' ἔδραμ' ὀπίσσω,
> ὣς τότε Τυδείδης ἀνεχάζετο, ...
>
> and as when a man crossing a wide plain
> stops, resourceless, at a swift-running river flowing to the sea
> when he sees it seething with foam, and he turns backward,
> so then the son of Tydeus gave way...

This simile reverses the imagery of a earlier simile, where Diomedes was compared to a raging torrent that menaced both armies (5.87-94); now Hektor is the river, before which Diomedes gives way.[45] He counsels the rest of the Greeks to retreat. Diomedes has apparently learned his lesson, and will not face a god without authorization.

Diomedes retreat, and Ares' intervention on the Trojan side, causes an Akhaian reverse; this in turn leads to more divine intervention. At 5.711, Hera notices that Hektor and the Trojans, urged on by Ares, are having great success against the Akhaians. She addresses Athene, and the two goddesses prepare to go to Olympos. Athene arms herself, in a variant of a typical description of mortals arming themselves.[46] Arming scenes, when applied to a mortal warrior,

---

45. The two similes are compared by Moulton (1977) 62.

regularly serve as the beginning of his *aristeia*. In the present case, Athene is on her way to perform an outstanding feat, wounding Ares and driving him from the battlefield; and so it seems that this arming scene serves as the beginning of her own *aristeia*.[47] With Hera as charioteer, the two goddesses go to Olympos, where Hera asks Zeus for permission to drive Ares from battle, blaming the war god's presence there on Aphrodite and Apollo (5.759-61). Zeus commands Hera to set Athene against Ares: "Come now, rouse Athene, the driver of the spoil, against him, who is especially accustomed to bring him evil pains" (ἄγρει μάν οἱ ἔπορσον Ἀθηναίην ἀγελείην, / ἥ ἑ μάλιστ' εἴωθε κακῆς ὀδύνῃσι πελάζειν, 5.765-66). Zeus had already matched Athene and Ares as an antagonistic pair in his rebuke to Aphrodite (5.430). His words here imply that their confrontation will be another instance of an often repeated pattern; Athene has brought pains to Ares many times. In other words, Diomedes' *aristeia* has led to a fresh outbreak of long-standing divine strife.

Once Hera and Athene reach the battlefield, Athene rebukes Diomedes with the comparison to Tydeus I discussed above.[48] I noted there that Athene's speech can be seen as a test of Diomedes' restraint, and his response shows that he is now obedient to Athene's commands. Athene then directs Diomedes to drive at Ares, and takes Sthenelos' place as charioteer (5.825-36). There is an interesting parallel between Athene's serving as charioteer for

46. On arming scenes see Arend (1933) 92-97, Armstrong (1958) 337-54, Fenik (1968) 73-74, 78-79.
47. A very similar description of Athene arming herself is at 8.384-96, but there her entry into battle is prevented by the command of Zeus. A scene of a mortal arming himself need not lead to an *aristeia*: Paris has an arming scene at 3.328-34, but is defeated in the duel that follows.
48. See above pp. xx-xx.

Diomedes and Hera serving as charioteer for Athene; in each case the goddess higher up in the hierarchy serves as the charioteer for the junior partner, and this matches the transmission of Zeus' authorization to wound Ares: first Hera is to set Athene upon Ares, and now Athene commands Diomedes to attack Ares. This reinforces what is already a very strong connection between Athene and Diomedes: she has been encouraging his exploits throughout his *aristeia* and supplying him with *menos*, and now is by his side as an ally (ἐπιτάρροθός εἰμι, 5.828; compare ἐπιτάρροθος ἦα, 5.808, in Athene's recollection of Tydeus). But the parallel between the two chariot scenes creates a strong similarity between the goddess and the hero, as does the fact that she is undergoing her own *aristeia*.

The confrontation with Ares moves quickly. Ares tries to strike Diomedes with his spear, but Athene pushes it aside (5.853-54).[49] Diomedes then strikes at Ares' belly with his spear, and Athene guides it. There are other instances of a god guiding a mortal's shot or thrust (the post-Iliadic slaying of Akhilleus by Paris and Apollo, mentioned at *Iliad* 19.416-17, 22.358-60, may be one example). But this is the only Iliadic passage where a mortal and a god participate in wounding another god. The fact that this passage is unparalleled, and so unexpected by the audience, gives the manner in which Ares is wounded special emphasis. Athene is invisible to Ares (5.844-45), but from the perspective of the audience, who has a more complete picture of the action than Ares, Diomedes and Athene both have full agency and responsibility for what happens. Ares' wounding confirms in emphatic fashion what Dione had said about the wounding of gods by mortals: it happens because the gods give pains to each other (5.384). But the fact

49. A parallel is Athene's blowing aside Hektor's spear after he throws it at Akhilleus (20.438-41).

that Ares is defeated by Diomedes and Athene as they undergo a joint *aristeia* suggests that the wounding of a god because of strife between gods is not far removed from open combat between the gods.

Ares on Olympos

Just as Aphrodite retreated to Olympos after her wounding, so too does Ares, and the ensuing scene develops the theme of strife among the gods; even Zeus himself is caught up in strife. Upon arriving at Olympos, Ares addresses a complaint to Zeus. His speech resembles the earlier complaints of Aphrodite and Apollo about Diomedes (5.871-86):

> Ζεῦ πάτερ οὐ νεμεσίζῃ ὁρῶν τάδε καρτερὰ ἔργα;
> αἰεί τοι ῥίγιστα θεοὶ τετληότες εἰμὲν
> ἀλλήλων ἰότητι, χάριν ἄνδρεσσι φέροντες.
> σοὶ πάντες μαχόμεσθα· σὺ γὰρ τέκες ἄφρονα κούρην
> οὐλομένην, ᾗ τ᾽ αἰὲν ἀήσυλα ἔργα μέμηλεν. 875
> ἄλλοι μὲν γὰρ πάντες ὅσοι θεοί εἰσ᾽ ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ
> σοί τ᾽ ἐπιπείθονται καὶ δεδμήμεσθα ἕκαστος·
> ταύτην δ᾽ οὔτ᾽ ἔπεϊ προτιβάλλεαι οὔτέ τι ἔργῳ,
> ἀλλ᾽ ἀνιεῖς, ἐπεὶ αὐτὸς ἐγείναο παῖδ᾽ ἀΐδηλον·
> ἣ νῦν Τυδέος υἱὸν ὑπερφίαλον Διομήδεα 880
> μαργαίνειν ἀνέηκεν ἐπ᾽ ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι.
> Κύπριδα μὲν πρῶτον σχεδὸν οὔτασε χεῖρ᾽ ἐπὶ καρπῷ,
> αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ᾽ αὐτῷ μοι ἐπέσσυτο δαίμονι ἶσος·
> ἀλλά μ᾽ ὑπήνεικαν ταχέες πόδες· ἦ τέ κε δηρὸν
> αὐτοῦ πήματ᾽ ἔπασχον ἐν αἰνῇσιν νεκάδεσσιν, 885
> ἢ κε ζὼς ἀμενηνὸς ἔα χαλκοῖο τυπῆσι.
>
> Father Zeus, aren't you angry, seeing these violent deeds?
> Always we gods suffer cruelly by each other's devices,
> when we give favor to men.
> With you we are all fighting: for you gave birth to that mindless girl,
> destructive, who is always intent on lawless deeds.
> For all the others, as many gods as there are on Olympos
> are obedient to you and each one of us are subject to you:
> but you do not at all oppose this one in word or in deed,
> but encourage her, since you yourself gave birth to this destructive child.

Now she has roused the son of Tydeus, haughty Diomedes,
to rage against the immortal gods.
First he wounded Kypris in close combat on the hand at the wrist,
and then he rushed on me myself, equal to a *daimon*.
But my swift feet carried me away: else surely I would have long suffered
pains there among the dread corpses,
or I would have lived without *menos* by the blows of the spear.

Ares repeats exactly the words of Apollo: "First he wounded Kypris in close combat on the hand at the wrist, then he rushed on me myself equal to a *daimon*" (Κύπριδα μὲν πρῶτον σχεδὸν οὔτασε χεῖρ᾽ ἐπὶ καρπῷ, / αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ᾽ αὐτῷ μοι ἐπέσσυτο δαίμονι ἶσος, 5.458-59). Ares' censure of Diomedes for going beyond the limits of mortal behavior is like Aphrodite's complaint, but an element present in both Aphrodite and Apollo's speeches, that Diomedes' behavior means that he would fight with Zeus, is absent. Instead, Ares says that *all the gods* are at war with Zeus. The danger is not that a mortal might attack the immortals, but that there is discord among the gods. Furthermore, this is not a new development, but a long-standing problem: the gods "always" (αἰεί, 5.872) suffer at each other's hands, and Athene is "always" (αἰὲν, 5.875) intent on unjust deeds (ἀήσυλα, 5.875) that cause the gods, in turn, to oppose Zeus, since he gives her free rein.

Zeus' response confirms the existence of strife in an unusual fashion (5.888-97):

μή τί μοι ἀλλοπρόσαλλε παρεζόμενος μινύριζε.
ἔχθιστος δέ μοί ἐσσι θεῶν οἳ Ὄλυμπον ἔχουσιν·
αἰεὶ γάρ τοι ἔρις τε φίλη πόλεμοί τε μάχαι τε.
μητρός τοι μένος ἐστὶν ἀάσχετον οὐκ ἐπιεικτὸν
Ἥρης· τὴν μὲν ἐγὼ σπουδῇ δάμνημ᾽ ἐπέεσσι·
τώ σ᾽ ὀΐω κείνης τάδε πάσχειν ἐννεσίῃσιν.
ἀλλ᾽ οὐ μάν σ᾽ ἔτι δηρὸν ἀνέξομαι ἄλγε᾽ ἔχοντα·
ἐκ γὰρ ἐμεῦ γένος ἐσσί, ἐμοὶ δέ σε γείνατο μήτηρ·
εἰ δέ τευ ἐξ ἄλλου γε θεῶν γένευ ὧδ᾽ ἀΐδηλος
καί κεν δὴ πάλαι ἦσθα ἐνέρτερος Οὐρανιώνων.

> Do not sit by me and whimper, fickle one.
> You are the most hateful to me of the gods who hold Olympos,
> for strife is always dear to you, and wars and battles.
> You have the ungovernable and unyielding spirit of your mother
> Hera; I can barely control her with words.
> So I think you suffer these things by her suggestions.
> But indeed I will no longer allow you to bear pains,
> for you are my offspring, and your mother bore you to me.
> If from any other god you had been borne so destructive,
> indeed long ago you would have been lower than the Ouranian gods.

This response confirms, if nothing else, that there is strife between Ares and Zeus. There are three indications of this conflict: the statement that Ares is the most hateful of the gods who hold Olympos (ἔχθιστος δέ μοί ἐσσι θεῶν οἳ Ὄλυμπον ἔχουσιν, 5.889) matches Agamemnon's statement that Akhilleus is the most hateful of all the kings (ἔχθιστος δέ μοί ἐσσι διοτρεφέων βασιλήων, 1.177), and in each case, the following explanatory line is identical (αἰεὶ γάρ τοι ἔρις τε φίλη πόλεμοί τε μάχαι τε, 1.178 = 5.890). The similarity of Agamemnon and Zeus' claims that their interlocutor is "most hated" suggests that the quarrel between Zeus and Ares and the quarrel between Agamemnon and Akhilleus are similar; in other words, the strife within the Akhaian community on the human level mirrors the strife within the Olympian community on the divine level. Again, there is long-lasting division: *eris* and fighting are "always" (αἰεὶ, 5.890) dear to Ares, just as Ares complained that the gods are always suffering because of each other. Zeus further calls Ares "destructive" (5.896), echoing Ares' own claim against Athene (8.879). Zeus goes on to fault Hera, complaining that he controls her only with difficulty (5.891-92). The charge that Ares suffers because of her urgings is true, but only because Zeus allowed Hera to drive Ares from battle and in fact encouraged her to set Athene upon him. Of course, Zeus'

speech would be appropriate, perhaps even more appropriate, to a circumstance in which Ares suffered because he carried out Hera's instructions. I would take this not as evidence of inconsistency, but rather a reference to a state of affairs in which Zeus and Hera have different goals (Zeus' speech itself provides ample demonstration that this is usually the case, as does much of Hera's conduct throughout the *Iliad*).

It is thus plausible for Zeus to blame Ares' present suffering on the intractability of Hera, rather than responding directly to Ares' complaints about Athene. But by doing so Zeus also indirectly affirms a part of what Ares says: Zeus does give the goddess free rein, and he does have trouble controlling other gods, some of whom are indeed fighting with him. Diomedes' heroism has ultimately served to confirm that there is disharmony among the gods, a state of affairs which implicitly threatens the stability of Zeus' rule. Interestingly, Zeus connects Ares' discontent with the succession myth: if he were not the son of Zeus and Hera, he would be lower than the Ouranian gods. "Ouranian" apparently refers to the Titans here;[50] if not for Ares' status as the son of Zeus and Hera, he would have been thrown even farther down into Tartaros than Kronos.

Zeus' rebuke of Ares encourages a retrospective reading of the passage in which he authorizes Hera to rouse Athene against Ares. Zeus' hatred of Ares can now be understood as a reason for allowing Athene to drive him from battle. What is striking is not simply that Zeus' action springs from rancor with another god, but especially that removing Ares from the field conflicts with Zeus' larger designs. In accordance with his promise to Thetis in Book 1, Zeus' aim is to honor Akhilleus by granting victory to the Trojans in his absence. Diomedes' brilliant

50. Elsewhere Οὐρανίωνες refers to the Olympians; see Kirk (1990) on 5.898.

exploits, abetted by Athene, interfere with this aim. Once Ares intervenes, however, the scales tip in the Trojans' favor; in other words, Ares' presence on the battlefield suits Zeus' aims. It is perhaps worth noting that Athene does not seek Zeus' approval before her grant of *menos* and *tharsos* that begins Diomedes' *aristeia*. Hera, however, does seek Zeus' approval to force Ares from battle, meaning that Zeus plainly assents to a course of action that diverts the narrative from his previously stated plan. Zeus' anger towards Ares, then, leads to the derailment of his *boulē*, which will last until his intervention in favor of the Trojans in Book 8.[51]

Conclusion

In my first two chapters I have shown how allusions to the pre-Trojan War past depict the Akhaians as a threat to cosmic stability. Diomedes' *aristeia* embodies this threat in an individual. In wounding immortals, and in repeatedly attacking Aineias while he is under Apollo's protection, Diomedes oversteps what should be a firm boundary between mortals and immortals. Athene's involvement in these incidents exposes a deeper problem: discord within the divine community. Not only is there strife between gods, but their involvement with mortals provides opportunities for the gods to act upon their hostility towards one another; this perpetuates and intensifies their discord. When Athene guides Diomedes' spear into Ares' belly, only Athene's disguise prevents this from being a scene of combat between gods. Even Zeus joins in strife, as his hatred for Ares leads him to allow Athene to drive Ares from battle. But by

51. See Cook (2009) 143. See also Friedman (2001) on the derailment of the *Dios boulē* in Books 13-14, caused there by the interventions of Poseidon and Hera. I agree with Clay (1999a) and Marks (2002) in seeing Zeus' promise to honor Akhilleus as part of a multifaceted *Dios boulē*, rather than constituting the entirety of Zeus' plan.

consenting to Ares' removal, Zeus permits the Akhaians to gain the upper hand, and so delays the fulfillment of his plans. Anger, in other words, leads Zeus to work against himself. This series of episodes amply illustrates that the greatest threat to divine order in the *Iliad* is not aggression directed toward the gods by mortals, but conflict among themselves.

Chapter Four: The Akhaian Wall

Near the end of Book 7, Nestor advises the Akhaians to build a wall to defend their camp and their ships (7.336-44). The wall is quickly built (7.436-39), but does not play an important role in the narrative until Book 12, when it becomes the central landmark in the fighting, as the Trojans threaten the Greek camp, are pushed back onto the plain, and then threaten the camp again. In antiquity, this extended narrative came to be known as the Teikhomakhia ("Assault on the Wall"). This battle is introduced by a description of the ultimate fate of the wall. In an unusual instance of prolepsis,[1] a short passage describes the destruction of the wall by the combined efforts of Zeus, Poseidon, and Apollo after the war's end, because the wall "was built against the will of the gods" (θεῶν δ' ἀέκητι τέτυκτο / ἀθανάτων, 12.8-9).

In this chapter, I show how the wall comes to be a symbol not only of a particular incident of disrespect towards the gods, but also of a more general human failing. My argument is based on an extended analysis of two passages from the *Iliad*. In the first (7.446-53), Poseidon, addressing the assembled gods on Olympos, complains that the Akhaians have not sacrificed in building the wall and that it will diminish the *kleos* of the wall that he and Apollo built for Troy. The failure to offer sacrifice is a serious offense, and causes an injury to the gods' *timē* similar to

1. On prolepsis, see Genette (1980) 67-79, who makes a helpful distinction between internal and external prolepses: an internal prolepsis anticipates an event that lies within the temporal frame of the story, while an external prolepsis refers to an event that occurs after the story has concluded; the wall's post-war removal qualifies as an external prolepsis. On prolepsis in Homer, see de Jong (1987), esp. 81-90, Richardson (1990) 132-39.

the dishonor that Akhilleus suffers when Agamemnon takes Briseis. The evidence of Greek religious practice suggests that the missing sacrifice may have been especially offensive to Poseidon and Apollo, as they are given cult as protectors of fortification walls.[2] Moreover, the Akhaians' offense parallels Laomedon's refusal to compensate Apollo and Poseidon for building the Trojan wall. Poseidon's complaint is a reminder that both communities have failed to honor the gods properly.

The second passage is the account of the wall's post-war destruction (12.1-33), in which Poseidon, Apollo, and Zeus jointly create a flood which sweeps all traces of the wall from the landscape. I argue that the wall's eradication comes to symbolize the entire Trojan War and the death of what the *Iliad* in a memorable phrase calls the "generation of demigod men" (ἡμιθέων γένος ἀνδρῶν, 12.24). This mention of the *hēmitheoi* equates the removal of the wall with the closure of the heroic age, and implies that the Akhaians' failure to sacrifice is emblematic of a wider pattern of disrepect for the gods.

I should clarify how this chapter fits in with my larger focus on landscape and mythological allusion. From the moment of its construction, the wall is a monumental component of the landscape of the Troad. The Trojans attack and seek to destroy the wall, and this corresponds to the Akhaians' attacks on the Trojan landscape. In the account of the wall's destruction (12.1-33), Apollo, Poseidon, and Zeus appear as elemental forces that sweep the wall into the sea, and the scale of violence necessary to remove the wall implies that it is an affront to

2. See Robertson (1984) 6-7, Graf (1985) 171-75, Mikalson (2005) 33-34.

the order of the cosmos.[3] As Ruth Scodel has shown, the destruction of the wall and the associated death of the *hēmitheoi* echo features of both Greek and Near Eastern traditions that parallel the relief of the earth theme. Scodel, however, understands the Iliadic *Dios boulē* as limited to the Wrath of Akhilleus, so that the notion that the Trojan War is planned to relieve the earth of overpopulation is not a thematic concern of the *Iliad*; rather, the Akhaian wall mobilizes this theme for pathetic effect.[4] In what follows I hope to demonstrate that the wall raises a thematic concern that most if not all of the poem's archaic audience would have recognized as a serious one, namely that of the consequences of mortal failure to pay appropriate respect to the gods. Moreover, for that segment of the audience which understood the *Dios boulē* as a plan to remove the heroes from the earth, the wall's destruction and the associated death of the ἡμιθέων γένος ἀνδρῶν would have represented its ultimate fulfillment, that is, the *telos* implied by the proem's notice that "the plan of Zeus was coming to fulfillment" (Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλὴ, 1.5).

Poseidon's Complaint (7.446-53)

In this section, I argue that Poseidon's complaint to Zeus in Book 7 about the Akhaian wall suggests two reasons that his indignation is justified: first, the Akhaians' failure to offer sacrifices for their wall injures the *timē* of the gods. The missing sacrifice is especially offensive to Poseidon, because he customarily receives cult as a protector of fortification walls. Second, the offense to the gods in general and to Poseidon in particular echoes the earlier insult suffered by

3. See Scully (1990) 26-28 and below.
4. Scodel (1982) 33-50; see further discussion below.

Poseidon when Laomedon refused to compensate him and Apollo for building the walls of Troy. Both the Akhaian wall and the Trojan wall, then, are built without giving the gods their due.

As the Akhaians are completing the wall around their camp, the scene switches to Olympos, where the gods "marvel at the great work" (θηεῦντο μέγα ἔργον, 7.444). Poseidon addresses the gods in outrage (7.446-53):

> Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἦ ῥά τίς ἐστι βροτῶν ἐπ᾽ ἀπείρονα γαῖαν
> ὅς τις ἔτ᾽ ἀθανάτοισι νόον καὶ μῆτιν ἐνίψει;
> οὐχ ὁράᾳς ὅτι δ᾽ αὖτε κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοὶ
> τεῖχος ἐτειχίσσαντο νεῶν ὕπερ, ἀμφὶ δὲ τάφρον
> ἤλασαν, οὐδὲ θεοῖσι δόσαν κλειτὰς ἑκατόμβας;
> τοῦ δ᾽ ἤτοι κλέος ἔσται ὅσον τ᾽ ἐπικίδναται ἠώς·
> τοῦ δ᾽ ἐπιλήσονται τὸ ἐγὼ καὶ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων
> ἥρῳ Λαομέδοντι πολίσσαμεν ἀθλήσαντε.
>
> Father Zeus, is there anyone of mortals on the boundless earth
> who still will declare his thinking and plan to the immortals?
> Don't you see that the long-haired Akhaians
> have built a wall over their ships, digging a trench around it,
> and they didn't give glorious hekatombs to the gods?
> And surely its fame is scattered as far as the dawn spreads,
> but they will forget the wall that I and Phoibos Apollo
> built for the hero Laomedon with great toil.

Poseidon says that mortals will no longer tell their intentions to the gods, and then raises two specific objections to the wall: the Akhaians have not made the necessary sacrifices before beginning construction and the wall will gain *kleos* at the expense of the wall which he and Apollo built for Troy. Previous scholars have found these grievances implausible and treated them as pretexts placed in Poseidon's mouth to justify the Akhaian wall's eventual destruction.[5] Yet Zeus is troubled (ὀχθήσας, 7.454) by this speech, which suggests that Poseidon's audience

5. See Scodel (1982) 34-35 and Kirk (1990) 288-89.

takes his concerns seriously. This should not be surprising, as his objections are based on issues of social prestige that are at stake throughout the *Iliad*. By mentioning that the Akhaians have failed to give sacrifice, Poseidon indicates that the gods' *timē* has been slighted, and by saying that the *kleos* of the Trojan wall is threatened, Poseidon implies that so is his own.

Poseidon presents the Akhaian wall as a rival of the Trojan wall in a zero-sum competition for *kleos*. The Akhaian wall, however, is best understood as a doublet of the Trojan wall. The construction of both walls is marked by acts of disrespect towards the gods. In his speech Poseidon mentions the Trojan wall but does not tell the story of its construction. The story is in fact not told in full anywhere in the *Iliad*, but it can be reconstructed from passages scattered throughout the epic. [6]The details that are most important for the present argument come from a speech by Poseidon in the *Theomakhia* (21.435-60). By Zeus' command, both gods served Laomedon for a year as hired workers (θητεύσαμεν, 21.444). Apollo tended the Trojans' cattle while Poseidon built the wall. When the year was up, Laomedon refused to pay the gods their agreed-upon wage (μισθῷ ἔπι ῥητῷ, 21. 445) and threatened to bind them, to sell them into distant islands, and even to cut off their ears. This anecdote focuses on loss of social prestige. Apollo and Poseidon are not only put under the command of a mortal ruler, but they are also placed among the lower levels of Homeric society.[7] *Thētes* are free men, but are not attached to an *oikos*, and so have a more tenuous existence than that of slaves.[8] They are at the edges of the networks of reciprocal exchange that characterize the Homeric economy, and instead of

6. On the reconstruction of this story see Lang (1983).
7. *Thētes* and *dmōes* are collocated at *Odyssey* 4.644.
8. Donlan (1997) 662-63, Finley (1978) 58-59, Raaflaub (1997) 638-39.

participating in gift exchange, *thētes* work for wages. Thus, Apollo and Poseidon's employment involves not only a loss of status, but also an exclusion from from the heroic and divine economy, a point emphasized by the repetition of *misthos* four times in the passage. Apollo and Poseidon are only temporarily *thētes*, but Laomedon delivers them a lasting insult by refusing to pay their wage and verbally insulting and threatening them. The lack of compensation arouses the anger of Apollo and Poseidon (μισθοῦ χωόμενοι, 21.457), and seems to be the origin of Poseidon's desire to see the Trojans perish (21.457-60). Clearly, Laomedon's actions slight the *timē* of Apollo and Poseidon.

Poseidon tells this story to taunt Apollo for his continued support of the Trojans, even though they have insulted him, but this necessarily reminds both Apollo and the poem's audience that Laomedon has also maltreated Poseidon. There is a wide gap between Poseidon's statement that he built the Trojan wall in Book 7 and the narration of the wall's construction in Book 21. The lack of detail that Poseidon provides in Book 7, however, suggests that the story would have been a familiar one both to the internal audience of the assembled gods and the external audience of the poem. By complaining about the possibility that men will "forget" (ἐπιλήσονται, 7.452) about the Trojan wall, Poseidon reminds the audience of his history with the wall and of an injury to his *timē*.

The Akhaians' omission of sacifice in building their wall echoes Laomedon's insults. More specifically, the failure to sacrifice echoes Laomedon's refusal to give Apollo and Poseidon their wages, as both actions are failures to properly conduct exchange with the gods. Through not

offering cult honors (*timai*), the Akhaians deprive the gods of *timē*.[9] Divine anger following a forgotten or improperly performed sacrifice is a conventional motif in mythic and epic narratives, and this has led some scholars to see the Akhaians' failure to offer sacrifice as little more than a pretext to justify the wall's removal.[10] The motif, however, echoes a genuine religious concern. In an instance that bears a passing resemblance to the destruction of the Akhaian wall, in 373 BCE the cities of Bura and Helike sank into the sea after an earthquake; afterwards it was said that the inhabitants had committed sacrilege against Poseidon.[11] If anything, the conventionality and frequency of the motif indicates that it was a compelling explanation of divine anger. In addition to the destruction of the Akhaian wall, several other instances of the pattern can be found in the *Iliad*, where omitted prayers and sacrifices appear to be conventional triggers for divine *mēnis*. In the assembly in Book 1, Akhilleus wonders if Apollo is angry because of a vow or a hekatomb (εἴτ' ἄρ' ὅ γ' εὐχωλῆς ἐπιμέμφεται ἠδ' ἑκατόμβης, 1.65); this could mean a forgotten vow or hekatomb, an incorrectly performed hekatomb, or an intentionally broken vow. During Diomedes' *aristeia* Aineias speculates that a god who has *mēnis* for the Trojans because of "sacrifices" (ἱρῶν μηνίσας, 5.178) is fighting on behalf of the Akhaians. Aineias' conjecture is incorrect, but Akhilleus' guess is closer to the mark: in Book 1 Apollo is indeed said to feel *mēnis* towards the Akhaians (1.75), but the cause is not, as Akhilleus supposes, a missing prayer or sacrifice, but the injury to Apollo's *timē* when Agamemnon dishonored the priest Krusēs

9. On injuries to *timē* as a cause of *mēnis*, see Muellner (1996) 49-51. On the definition of *timai* as cult honors, see Nagy (1979) 118§1n2, 151.
10. e.g., Scodel (1982) 34.
11. Diodorus Siculus 15.49, Pausanias 7.24; Herakleides Fr. 46 (Wehrli); Burkert 402.

(ἠτίμησ', 1.94). This instance of divine *mēnis* is closely similar to Akhilleus' *mēnis* for Agamemnon, which begins when Agamemnon seizes Briseis, leaving Akhilleus "dishonored" (ἄτιμος ἐὼν, 1.171). Poseidon's anger at the Akhaians' failure to sacrifice is thus parallel to the central theme of the *Iliad*.

Another instance of this motif occurs in Phoinix's story of Meleagros (9.529-99). Oineus offered hekatombs to all the gods save Artemis. As a consequence, Artemis sent the Kalydonian boar, which led to the war between the Kourētes and the Aitolians. The offense was probably not deliberate. Phoinix says that Oineus did not offer firstfruits to Artemis because "either he forgot, or did not recognize, for he was greatly blinded in his heart" (ἢ λάθετ' ἢ οὐκ ἐνόησεν· ἀάσατο δὲ μέγα θυμῷ, 9.537). Intent, however, is beside the point. Forgetting to sacrifice and deliberately omitting sacrifice both deprive a god of *timē* and bring on divine anger. In this case, Artemis is not said to experience *mēnis*, but rather *kholos* (9.538).

Hesiod provides an example where a social group, rather than an individual, fails to sacrifice and the failure merits destruction. In the Myth of Ages in the *Works and Days*, the silver generation refuses to give *timai* to the gods and is destroyed by Zeus (*Works and Days* 134-39):

> ὕβριν γὰρ ἀτάσθαλον οὐκ ἐδύναντο
> ἀλλήλων ἀπέχειν, οὐδ' ἀθανάτους θεραπεύειν
> ἤθελον οὐδ' ἔρδειν μακάρων ἱεροῖς ἐπὶ βωμοῖς,
> ἢ θέμις ἀνθρώποις κατὰ ἤθεα. τοὺς μὲν ἔπειτα
> Ζεὺς Κρονίδης ἔκρυψε χολούμενος, οὕνεκα τιμὰς
> οὐκ ἔδιδον μακάρεσσι θεοῖς, οἳ Ὄλυμπον ἔχουσιν.
>
> For they could not keep reckless *hubris* from one another,
> nor were they willing to serve the gods
> or to sacrifice upon the sacred altars of the blessed ones,
> which is *themis* for men in accordance with custom. And then

> Zeus the son of Kronos concealed them, angered, because
> they did not give *timai* to the blessed gods who hold Olympos.

Zeus "conceals" (ἔκρυψε, *Works and Days* 138) this generation for its refusal to honor the gods. It is the fate of each of the first four of Hesiod's generations to be "covered" by earth: the same line, "and when the earth covered this generation..." (αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τοῦτο γένος κατὰ γαῖ' ἐκάλυψε, *Works and Days* 122, 140, 157) marks the passing of each of the first three generations, and similar diction (ἔνθ' ἤτοι τοὺς μὲν θανάτου τέλος ἀμφεκάλυψε, *Works and Days* 166) describes the end of the fourth generation, the race of heroes. It is hardly surprising for the dead to be beneath the earth, but Zeus takes an active role in bringing about the end of two generations: he "conceals" (Ζεὺς Κρονίδης ἔκρυψε, *Works and Days* 138) the silver generation, and "destroys" (ὀλέσει, *Works and Days* 180) the iron generation.[12] Both generations receive strongly negative characterizations.[13]

With these examples of divine anger at the loss of *timē* in mind, we can discern more extensive parallels between the plot of the *Iliad* and the story of the Trojan wall. In Lang's reconstruction, Poseidon exacted revenge by sending a sea monster (*kētos*, 20.147) to ravage the Trojan seashore. The poem gives no explicit indication that the monster is connected to Laomedon's insults, but as Lang argues, the parallel between Laomedon's refusal to pay Poseidon and Apollo their wages and his refusal to give Herakles his promised reward suggests that the

12. Zeus also takes an active hand in determining the ultimate fate of the heroic generation: many are killed either at Thebes or Troy, but some are settled by Zeus at the ends of the earth, apart from men, on the Islands of the Blessed (168-71). This fate can be considered a variant of the concealment that is the fate of the other generations. As Crane (1988: 15-16) notes, the island of Kalypso, the "Concealer," is a multiform of the Islands of the Blessed.
13. On the similarity of the silver and iron generations, see Gatz (167: 31-33).

incidents may have been part of a larger narrative.[14] If this connection is correct, the story of the first sack of Troy bears an interesting resemblance to the story of the *Iliad*. First, a god is insulted by a mortal who is the leader of a community (Laomedon refuses to give Poseidon his wages; Agamemnon insults Apollo's priest Khryses). Second, the god sends a calamity upon the community (Poseidon sends a sea monster; Apollo, a plague). Next, a hero relieves the community (Herakles presumably fights off the monster; Akhilleus calls the assembly that leads to the return of Khryseis). The leader then insults the hero (Laomedon does not compensate Herakles; Agamemnon takes Briseis from Akhilleus), who brings disaster upon the community (Herakles sacks Troy; Akhilleus withdraws from battle).[15] This set of parallels strengthens the case for seeing Poseidon's anger at his loss of *timē* due to the Akhaians' failure to sacrifice as well-grounded in a concern for honor that pervades the *Iliad*. Both the first sack of Troy and the *Iliad* itself are set in motion by insults to gods' honor.

Poseidon does not portray the missing sacrifice as an insult directed specifically at him. Instead, he speaks of a sacrifice owed to all the gods: the Akhaians "did not give glorious hekatombs to the gods" (οὐδὲ θεοῖσι δόσαν κλειτὰς ἑκατόμβας, 7.450). These words are echoed by the narrator in the account of the wall's destruction (οὐδὲ θεοῖσι δόσαν κλειτὰς ἑκατόμβας, 12.6), and the narrator's statement that the wall "was built against the will of the gods" (θεῶν δ' ἀέκητι τέτυκτο / ἀθανάτων, 12.8-9) implies that their displeasure is collective and unified. An archaic Greek audience, however, may have had good reason to think that Poseidon had a special interest

14. Lang (1983) 148.
15. As the "theft" of a woman, Agamemnon's removal of Briseis duplicates the abduction of Helen that sparked the war.

in the omitted sacrifice, since, as I show below, Poseidon received cult as a protector of fortification walls and gates.[16] This religious fact may motivate Poseidon's role in building the Trojan wall as well, and the same factor may be at work with Apollo, who was also considered a protector of fortification walls, and was known as a founder and patron god of cities.

Before I detail the roles of Poseidon and Apollo as protectors of walls, it is important to establish that the Akhaian camp is modeled on the Homeric *polis*; its wall is thus crafted in the image of a city wall. As Kurt Raaflaub has noted, the camp is never called a *polis* (or *astu*); it is called a *stratos*, a camp (e.g., 15.657, 16.73). Nevertheless, Raaflaub demonstrates that in most respects the Akhaian camp possesses the physical form and social institutions of the Homeric *polis*.[17] At the center of the camp, by the ships of Odysseus, there is a common space for political and religious activity (11.806-808):

> ἀλλ᾽ ὅτε δὴ κατὰ νῆας Ὀδυσσῆος θείοιο
> ἵξε θέων Πάτροκλος, ἵνά σφ᾽ ἀγορή τε θέμις τε
> ἦην, τῇ δὴ καί σφι θεῶν ἐτετεύχατο βωμοί...
>
> But when Patroklos came to the ships of godlike Odysseus
> as he ran, where their assembly and place of judgment was,
> and where also the altars of the gods were built...

Here *agorē* and *themis* are different names for the same space, indicating its function as a place of assembly and of juridical activity. The mention of altars indicates that it is also a sacred space, where the Akhaians conduct sacrifices in common (cf. 8.249-50). The combination of assembly, court, and sacred space in the center of a settlement is a familiar one, and duplicates the

16. See Robertson (1984) 6-7, Graf (1985) 171-75, Mikalson (2005) 33-34.
17. For the location of Odysseus' ships in the center of the camp, see Hainsworth (1993) on 11.5-9; for the similarities between the Akhaian camp and the Homeric *polis* see Raaflaub (1993) 47-48.

arrangement of some historical archaic *poleis*;[18] similar arrangements are found in the Homeric cities of Troy and Skherie.[19] The activities that take place here are more telling than the spatial arrangement; in this space, the Akhaians conduct themselves as a political and religious community, holding collective assemblies and rituals. It is therefore clear that an archaic audience would have seen the Akhaian camp as a community essentially similar to other communities which Homeric poetry calls *poleis*.

Most Homeric *poleis* do not possess walls, but when present, they are prominent features of the *polis*.[20] Stephen Scully has argued that walls metonymically represent the *polis*,[21] and Poseidon reflects such an idea when he describes the Trojan wall "which I and Phoebus Apollo founded for the hero Laomedon with great toil" (τὸ ἐγὼ καὶ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων / ἥρῳ Λαομέδοντι πολίσσαμεν ἀθλήσαντε, 7.452-53). I have translated πολίσσαμεν as "founded," but this verb has also been defined as "built" or "fortified."[22] In origin πολίζω is a denominative verb from the noun πόλις, and its root sense seems to be factitive—"make a *polis*."[23] In recounting his lineage Aineias uses this sense in a *figura etymologica*: "since not yet was sacred Ilios founded in the plain as a city of mortal men" (ἐπεὶ οὔ πω Ἴλιος ἱρὴ / ἐν πεδίῳ πεπόλιστο πόλις μερόπων ἀνθρώπων,

18. See, for instance, Hammer (2002) 36-38 on the agora of Dreros.
19. Raaflaub (1993) 47-48.
20. City walls are uncommon in historical archaic *poleis*, but are found with more frequency in colonial foundations; see Raaflaub (1993) 52-53.
21. See Scully (1990) 41-53.
22. On 7.453 Posidonios glosses πολίσσαμεν as τεῖχος ἐτειχίσσαντο; Snell, s.v. πολίσσαι, gives the definition "errichten, gründen"; Ameis ad loc. notes "*πολίζω* hier baue zur Befestigung der Stadt." Note also the translation of Scully (1990, 48): "in building the wall I citied Troy."
23. On denominative verbs see Sihler (1995) 511-14.

20.219-20).[24] With his use of πολίσσαμεν Poseidon portrays the building of the wall as an act which "makes the city"—one which transforms the spatial arrangement of the city and gives Troy its most distinctive physical feature.[25]

In the *Odyssey*'s account of the foundation of Skherie by its oikist Nausithoos, the wall is the first element of the new settlement to be mentioned: "He drove a wall around the *polis*, and built houses, and made temples for the gods, and apportioned the fields" (ἀμφὶ δὲ τεῖχος ἔλασσε πόλει, καὶ ἐδείματο οἴκους, / καὶ νηοὺς ποίησε θεῶν, καὶ ἐδάσσατ' ἀρούρας, *Odyssey* 6.9-10). This account is often seen as a paradigmatic example of the foundation of a colony.[26] As Irad Malkin notes, Nausithoos' activities have to do with territorial organization—for example, by building temples he separates sacred space from profane.[27] The city wall is thus an essential element of the spatial organization of the new community.

The Akhaian camp can be seen as a colony; it is a settlement of men from foreign lands, surrounded by a wall to protect them from hostile inhabitants. Circuit walls are rare in historical archaic *poleis*, but they are found more frequently in colonies. Raaflaub has noted similarities between the Akhaian wall's wooden palisades and superstructure and the walls of Old Smyrna.[28] It has been argued that Skherie is modeled upon the Ionian colonization of Asia Minor.[29] The

---

24. 7.453 and 20.220 are the only occurrences of πολίζω in Homer.
25. Hammer (2002) 34.
26. On Skherie as a model colony, see Graham (1964) 29, Malkin (1987) 138, Dougherty (1993) 23.
27. Malkin (1987) 138.
28. Raaflaub (1993) 52-53.
29. See Crielaard (1995) 236-39. Modern scholarship usually treats the settlement of Asia Minor as a distinct phenomenon from 8th century and later colonization, but as Graham (1964: 2) notes, classical Greeks saw no distinction between the Ionian colonies and colonies established

Akhaian camp might have been seen as also following the model of Ionian cities to the south of the Troad, and in this connection it is interesting to note that Homeric poetry is often thought to have undergone a significant phase of development in this area.[30] The Akhaian camp is not a permanent settlement and so is not a colony in any literal sense, just as the camp is not a *polis* in the full sense of the word. The point here, however, is that the description of the camp follows the pattern of a *polis*, and has features distinctive to colonial *poleis*. This description encourages the audience to interpret the camp and its walls in light of their knowledge of poetic and historical cities and colonies.

At Erythrae in Asia Minor, Poseidon was among a group of gods who were given joint sacrifice at the city gate for the protection of the gate and city wall; the other recipients were Herakles Kallinikos, Apollo, and Artemis.[31] At this sacrifice Poseidon's title was Asphaleios, the "Steadfast" or "Securer." Noel Robertson points out that this title could apply to several of the god's areas of competence, and accordingly Poseidon Asphaleios is sometimes invoked as a giver of safety to sailors.[32] In many contexts, however, this title is a reference to Poseidon's power to cause earthquakes, an ability indicated in epic by his epithets *ennosigaios*, *enosikhthon*, and *gaiēokhos*. Strabo (1.57) relates that after volcanic activity created a new island between Thera and Therasia, the Rhodians landed and founded a temple to Poseidon Asphaleios. At the Delian Poseidea, the god received the titles Asphaleios and Orthosios, according to a sacrificial calendar

---

during the historical period. On the same point see also Malkin (1987) 4.
30. The bibliography on this subject is large; see e.g. Horrocks (1997) 212.
31. *IE* 207 A2, on which see Graf (1985) 171-75; see also Mikalson (2005) 33-34; Robertson (1984) 6-7.
32. Robertson (1984) 6.

covering the years 314-166 BCE, and Poseidon Asphaleios had a sanctuary there; Delos was held to be free from earthquakes, and Poseidon seems to have received sacrifices and prayers to ensure that the island remained free of seismic disturbance.[33] In 246 BCE a sacrifice is recorded for Poseidon Themelioukhos ("holder of foundations"); this title is found elsewhere, including Eleusis, where it denotes Poseidon's protection of agricultural terrace walls and embankments.[34] This epithet is apotropaic, as is Asphaleios—Poseidon is a "holder of foundations" because he can destroy them, and he is "steadfast" because he is responsible for seismic instability. The destruction of the Akhaian wall plays out the logic of sacrifice to Poseidon Asphaleios and Themelioukhos—if his protection is not sought through ritual action, his destructive powers are unleashed.

Apollo is known as a patron and founder of cities, most notably through the role the Delphic Oracle played in archaic Greek colonization, beginning in the 8th century BCE.[35] Consultation with the oracle seems to have been a regular part of a colonial expedition. The oracle sanctioned the expedition and identified the oikist, which, as Malkin notes, creates the impression that colonization occurs at Apollo's initiative; Apollo himself was said to be the oikist of several colonies.[36] As discussed above, an important facet of the oikist's activity was the apportionment of territory, and when present, the city wall played a signal role in defining the

33. Mikalson (2005) 33-34; Robertson (1984) 6-7.
34. At Delos: Durrbach (1926) 290.116; at Eleusis: Robertson (1984) 4; see also Apollodorus *FGrHist* 244.96.
35. On the dating of the oracle's role in colonization, see Morgan (1990) 172-78.
36. Malkin (1987) 5 and *passim*. The bibliography on Apollo's role in colonization is immense; in addition to Malkin, see Burkert (1985) 144, Calame (2003), Graham (1964).

spatial arrangement of the new settlement. As also noted above, Apollo was given sacrifice at the city gate of Erythrae along with Poseidon Asphaleios. Apollo was also credited with "towering" (*epurgōsas*) the walls of Megara by Theognis (773-74).[37] These cultic connections with the foundation of cities and the protection of city walls help explain why Apollo is paired with Poseidon in the construction of the Trojan wall, and why Apollo participates in destroying the Akhaian wall in Book 12.

For Poseidon, the Akhaian wall presents a problem not only of *timē* but also of *kleos*. He claims that the wall's fame "is spread as far as the dawn spreads" (ἔσται ὅσον τ᾽ ἐπικίδναται ἠώς, 7.451) and that the fame of the Trojan wall will be forgotten (*epilēsontai*, 7.452). Poseidon opposes *kleos* to "forgetting" (*lēthē*), and treats the Akhaian and Trojan walls as physical monuments that perpetuate *kleos*, much like a funeral monument (*sēma*).[38] The Trojan wall is in danger of being forgotten as a consequence of its impending physical erasure. The Trojan wall will not save the city, and will presumably be destroyed when the city is sacked (21.516-17). The Akhaian wall is not invulnerable: Hektor breaches one of its gates (12.445-71) and Apollo later knocks a section of the wall to the ground (15.335-66). The Trojans are eventually able to enter the camp and set the ship of Protesilaos on fire. Nevertheless, the Akhaian wall must survive the

37. Scully (1990) 52.
38. See Sinos (1980) 47, Nagy (1983) 46, on the *sēma* as a sign of a hero's *kleos*; see Scodel (1982) 48n38, Ford (1992) 150-54 on the Akhaian wall as analagous to a tomb. Nagy (1979) 160§16n1 sees the wall as a variant of the tradition that the Akhaians built a funeral mound for Akhilleus by the Hellespont (*Odyssey* 24.80-84). The wall's smoothing over by the rivers is thus "an ironic fulfillment of the dire threat made by the river Xanthos/Skamandros to bury Achilles under a mound of silt..."

war largely intact, given the scale of its post-war destruction described at the beginning of Book 12. If it were to remain standing, it would be a physical monument of the *kleos* of the Akhaians.

In response to Poseidon, Zeus proposes the post-war destruction of the wall. But instead of causing *lēthē*, the *kleos* of the wall is augmented by its obliteration. In the Homeric poems, *kleos* is above all renown transmitted by epic poetry.[39] The wall is swept away with no physical trace left, but this erasure is commemorated by the *Iliad*. Poseidon's effort to do away with the wall as a physical monument results in its preservation through poetry, though ironically through an account of its physical obliteration. The act that Poseidon hopes will cause *lēthē* thus contributes to the *kleos* of the Akhaian wall. In a further irony, Poseidon's fear that the Trojan wall will lose its *kleos* is without foundation, since it too is given fame through its portrayal in epic, long after it has ceased to exist as a physical monument.

To sum up, the Akhaian wall gives Poseidon good reason to complain. The lack of sacrifice for the wall denies *timē* to the gods; this injury is especially perturbing to Poseidon since he receives cult as a protector of fortification walls. In addition, the Akhaians' failure to give Poseidon his due repeats the insult the sea god suffered when Laomedon refused to compensate him and Apollo for building the walls of Troy. The Akhaian wall, then, is offensive to the gods in its own right, but also recalls the Trojans' past transgressions. Both walls, the Akhaian and Trojan, are monuments of each community's disrespect towards the gods.

39. Nagy (1979) 15-18.

The Destruction of the Akhaian Wall (12.1-33)

In this section, I argue that the proleptic narrative of the destruction of the Akhaian wall that opens Book 12 employs the eradication of the wall as a symbol of the removal of the heroes from the earth through the Trojan War. The wall's obliteration is set after the war has ended and the Greeks have returned home, making this event the close of the heroic age. The sense that this event closes an era is accentuated by the passage's description of the heroes as the "generation of demigod men" (ἡμιθέων γένος ἀνδρῶν, 12.24). This rare term is found elsewhere in contexts where the era of the heroes, removed from the earth through war, is viewed from the distancing perspective of the audience's own day. The wall is swept from the earth by a massive flood created by the joint efforts of Poseidon, Apollo, and Zeus. This cosmic flood parallels Greek and Near Eastern myths in which a divinely sent deluge punishes humanity for impiety. As I showed in the previous section, the wall is a marker of disrespect towards the gods from both the Akhaians and the Trojans. In Book 12, the narrator now names the Akhaians' failure to sacrifice for their wall as the reason it will be destroyed by the gods (12.8-9). The *Iliad* has adapted a narrative of a catastrophic flood destroying impious humanity into a narrative of a catastrophic flood destroying a symbol of human impiety; this destruction is closely associated with the death of the *hēmitheoi*, removed from the earth through the Trojan War.

Poseidon's complaint about the Akhaian wall in Book 7, like all character speech, is motivated by his own concerns. The account of the wall's destruction (12.1-33), however, is told from the more objective and authoritative perspective of the narrator. The lack of sacrifice after the wall's construction is once again mentioned, now as a reason for the wall's destruction.

Because the wall was built against the gods' will, it will not last. But the obliteration of the wall occurs after the Trojan War is over. In a remarkable instance of prolepsis, the narrator speaks of a time after the Trojan War has concluded and the Greeks have returned home. This is the only passage in the *Iliad* which contains extensive narration of events that happen after the conclusion of its primary fabula.[40] These events, in fact, will be the closing events of the heroic era.

ὣς ὃ μὲν ἐν κλισίῃσι Μενοιτίου ἄλκιμος υἱὸς
ἰᾶτ' Εὐρύπυλον βεβλημένον· οἳ δὲ μάχοντο
Ἀργεῖοι καὶ Τρῶες ὁμιλαδόν· οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔμελλε
τάφρος ἔτι σχήσειν Δαναῶν καὶ τεῖχος ὕπερθεν
εὐρύ, τὸ ποιήσαντο νεῶν ὕπερ, ἀμφὶ δὲ τάφρον
ἤλασαν· οὐδὲ θεοῖσι δόσαν κλειτὰς ἑκατόμβας·
ὄφρά σφιν νῆάς τε θοὰς καὶ λῃΐδα πολλὴν
ἐντὸς ἔχον ῥύοιτο· θεῶν δ' ἀέκητι τέτυκτο
ἀθανάτων· τὸ καὶ οὔ τι πολὺν χρόνον ἔμπεδον ἦεν.
ὄφρα μὲν Ἕκτωρ ζωὸς ἔην καὶ μήνι' Ἀχιλλεὺς
καὶ Πριάμοιο ἄνακτος ἀπόρθητος πόλις ἔπλεν,
τόφρα δὲ καὶ μέγα τεῖχος Ἀχαιῶν ἔμπεδον ἦεν.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ μὲν Τρώων θάνον ὅσσοι ἄριστοι,
πολλοὶ δ' Ἀργείων οἳ μὲν δάμεν, οἳ δὲ λίποντο,
πέρθετο δὲ Πριάμοιο πόλις δεκάτῳ ἐνιαυτῷ,
Ἀργεῖοι δ' ἐν νηυσὶ φίλην ἐς πατρίδ' ἔβησαν,
δὴ τότε μητιόωντο Ποσειδάων καὶ Ἀπόλλων
τεῖχος ἀμαλδῦναι ποταμῶν μένος εἰσαγαγόντες.
ὅσσοι ἀπ' Ἰδαίων ὀρέων ἅλαδὲ προρέουσι,
Ῥῆσός θ' Ἑπτάπορός τε Κάρησός τε Ῥοδίος τε
Γρήνικός τε καὶ Αἴσηπος δῖός τε Σκάμανδρος
καὶ Σιμόεις, ὅθι πολλὰ βοάγρια καὶ τρυφάλειαι
κάππεσον ἐν κονίῃσι καὶ ἡμιθέων γένος ἀνδρῶν·
τῶν πάντων ὁμόσε στόματ' ἔτραπε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων,
ἐννῆμαρ δ' ἐς τεῖχος ἴει ῥόον· ὗε δ' ἄρα Ζεὺς
συνεχές, ὄφρά κε θᾶσσον ἁλίπλοα τείχεα θείη.
αὐτὸς δ' ἐννοσίγαιος ἔχων χείρεσσι τρίαιναν
ἡγεῖτ', ἐκ δ' ἄρα πάντα θεμείλια κύμασι πέμπε
φιτρῶν καὶ λάων, τὰ θέσαν μογέοντες Ἀχαιοί,

40. Ford (1992) 148.

λεῖα δ᾽ ἐποίησεν παρ᾽ ἀγάρροον Ἑλλήσποντον,
αὖτις δ᾽ ἠϊόνα μεγάλην ψαμάθοισι κάλυψε
τεῖχος ἀμαλδύνας· ποταμοὺς δ᾽ ἔτρεψε νέεσθαι
κὰρ ῥόον, ᾗ περ πρόσθεν ἴεν καλλίρροον ὕδωρ.

Thus among the huts the mighty son of Menoitios
was tending the wounded Eurypylos, but the Argives and Trojans
were fighting in close contact, and the trench of the Danaans
and the wide wall above it would not protect them for long,
which they had built over their ships and had driven a trench around
(but they had not given glorious hekatombs to the gods),
so that it might hold within and keep safe their swift ships
and great booty. But it was built against the will
of the immortal gods, and it did not hold firm for long.
As long as Hektor lived and Akhilleus had *mēnis*
and the city of lord Priam was unsacked,
so long was the great wall of the Akhaians firm.
But when all the best of the Trojans had died,
and many of the Argives—some died, some were left—
and the city of Priam was sacked in the tenth year,
and the Argives went to their dear homeland in their ships,
even then Poseidon and Apollo contrived
to blot out the wall, turning on it the force of all the rivers
that flow from the summits of Ida towards the sea,
Rhēsos, Heptaporos, Karēsos, Rhodios,
Grēnikos, Aisopos, and divine Skamander,
and Simoeis, where many ox-hide shields and crested helmets
fell in the dust, and the race of demigod men.
Phoibos Apollo turned the mouths of all of them together,
and for nine days he sent their flood against the wall, and Zeus
rained ceaselessly, so that he might quickly sweep the walls into the sea.
And the Earthshaker himself, holding the trident in his hands,
led them, and he sent into the waves all the foundations
of logs and stones that the Akhaians had set up with toil,
and he made all smooth beside the strong-flowing Hellespont,
and again covered the great shore with sand,
blotting out the wall. And he returned the rivers
to their streams where they had sent their fair-flowing water before.

In this passage the narrator pulls back from immediate events to survey the entire heroic age from the perspective of his own day.[41] The passage proceeds chronologically from a specific moment in the *Iliad* down to the post-war destruction of the wall, but each stage in the progression of time also evokes a span of time, and these timeframes grow progressively larger, each encompassing the last like concentric circles. The expanding temporal perspective is matched by a spatial expansion. First, the focus is on a specific moment and place, as Patroklos dresses Eurypylos' wound in his hut (1-2). After this scene of two named characters in a specific location, the narrator takes in a broader slice of time and space as he describes the battle continuing outside the huts, where the Akhaians and the Trojans are fighting *en masse* (ὁμιλαδόν, 2). This view of general battle is accompanied by a notice that the wall will not keep the Akhaians safe for long (4-9). Next, by saying that the wall stood "as long as Hektor lived and Akhilleus had *mēnis*," the narrator evokes the timespan of the *Iliad* itself (10-12).[42] Then, the narrative proceeds to a time after the end of the Trojan War and the *nostoi* of the heroes (13-16). These lines not only place us after the war but aptly sum up the entire course of the war, and also expand the geographic focus from the Troad to the entire Greek world.

Now Poseidon and Apollo plan to destroy the wall (17-18). As part of a catalogue of the rivers Apollo diverts to wash away the wall, the narrator refers to the Simoeis as the site of the fighting at Troy, where many shields and helmets and the "race of demigod men" (ἡμιθέων γένος

41. See Reinhardt (1961) 267. See also Jenny Strauss Clay's treatment of this passage, which associates each of these timeframes with different interpretations of the *Dios boulē* (Clay 1999a: 47-50). Note too that in foregrounding the narrator's chronological separation from the events he narrates, this passage resembles the proem.
42. Ford (1992) 151-52.

ἀνδρῶν, 23) fell in the dust. This mention of the *hēmitheoi* is not mere scene-setting, but accentuates the distance between the age of heroes and the here-and-now of his own time. This is in fact the sole occurrence of *hēmitheoi* in Homer. Gregory Nagy has shown that it is especially appropriate to the retrospective viewpoint of this passage, as the non-Homeric examples also occur in contexts that look at the heroes as figures from a bygone era.[43]

Two examples from Hesiodic poetry are especially illuminating here. The first is from a section of the *Catalogue of Women*, following the marriage of Helen to Menelaos, that describes how Zeus planned the Trojan War (fr. 204.95-103MW):[44]

πάντες δὲ θεοὶ δίχα θυμὸν ἔθεντο
ἐξ ἔριδος· δὴ γὰρ τότε μήδετο θέσκελα ἔργα
Ζεὺς ὑψιβρεμέτης, †μεῖξαι κατ᾽ ἀπείρονα γαῖαν
τυρβάξας,† ἤδη δὲ γένος μερόπων ἀνθρώπων
πολλὸν ἀϊστῶσαι σ̣π̣ε̣ῦ̣δ̣ε̣, π̣ρ̣[ό]φασιν μὲν ὀλέσθαι
ψυχὰς ἡμιθέω[ν ....]ο̣ι̣σ̣ι̣ βροτοῖσι
τέκ̣να θεῶν μι[...].[..]ο̣.[ὀφ]θαλμοῖσιν ὁρῶντα,
ἀλλ̣᾽ ο̣ἳ μ[ὲ]ν μάκ̣[α]ρ̣ε̣ς κ̣[.....]ν̣ ὡ̣ς̣ τ̣ὸ̣ πάρος περ
χωρ̣ὶς ἀπ᾽ ἀν[θ]ρ̣ώπω̣ν̣[βίοτον κα]ὶ̣ ἤθε᾽ ἔχωσιν

and all the gods were divided into two factions
by strife: for then high-thundering Zeus was planning
amazing deeds, to stir up troubles on the boundless earth,
and he was eager to make the multitudinous race of mortal men
disappear, and he gave as a reason to destroy
the lives of the *hēmitheoi* … to mortals …
children of the gods …
but the blessed ones … as before
might have their livelihood and accustomed haunts apart from men

43. Nagy (1979) 159-60; see also Clay (2003) 30.
44. On this passage see West (1961) 132-36, Scodel (1982) 37-38, Burkert (1992) 102, Koenen (1994) 26-34, West (1997) 480-81, Clay (2005) 29-34.

This passage contains a number of features associated with the theme of relieving the earth: strife between the gods (ἐξ ἔριδος, 96) that is caused by entanglement with mortals, overpopulation of the earth (γένος μερόπων ἀνθρώπων / πολλὸν, 97-98), and a plan to cause the deaths of many men. It is unfortunately unclear exactly what is meant by πρ̣[ό]φασιν μὲν ὀλέσθαι / ψυχὰς ἡμιθέω[ν … (99-100),[45] but the last lines of this passage refer unmistakably to the separation of gods from men, and a few lines after this passage we find references to the deaths of many heroes (118-19). While much is uncertain about this fragment it is clear that it depicts the end of close contact between gods and mortals—in short, the end of the heroic age, which will be accomplished through a plan to kill many men.[46] This seems to be the logical endpoint of the *Catalogue,* since it is devoted to cataloguing the descendants of unions between gods and mortals. The context of this passage, then, is similar to that of *Iliad* 12 insofar as it depicts the end of the heroic age and emphasizes the difference between that time and the current day, but the Hesiodic passage associates the death of the *hēmitheoi* with the overpopulation and relief of the earth.

The term *hēmitheoi* is also found in Hesiod's description of the fourth generation in the *Works and Days* (157-68):

> αὖτις ἔτ' ἄλλο τέταρτον ἐπὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ
> Ζεὺς Κρονίδης ποίησε, δικαιότερον καὶ ἄρειον,
> ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων θεῖον γένος, οἳ καλέονται

45. West (1997: 480-81) takes πρ̣[ό]φασιν as meaning that the destruction of the souls of heroes is an "ostensible reason" for the plan to destroy the race of men; this seems to rely on understanding *prophasis* as "pretext," but it is possible that it might have referred to a "cause" or a "declaration."
46. Scodel (1982) 37-38.

ἡμίθεοι, προτέρη γενεὴ κατ᾽ ἀπείρονα γαῖαν.
καὶ τοὺς μὲν πόλεμός τε κακὸς καὶ φύλοπις αἰνή,
τοὺς μὲν ὑφ᾽ ἑπταπύλῳ Θήβῃ, Καδμηίδι γαίῃ,
ὤλεσε μαρναμένους μήλων ἕνεκ᾽ Οἰδιπόδαο,
τοὺς δὲ καὶ ἐν νήεσσιν ὑπὲρ μέγα λαῖτμα θαλάσσης
ἐς Τροίην ἀγαγὼν Ἑλένης ἕνεκ᾽ ἠυκόμοιο.
ἔνθ᾽ ἤτοι τοὺς μὲν θανάτου τέλος ἀμφεκάλυψε,
τοῖς δὲ δίχ᾽ ἀνθρώπων βίοτον καὶ ἤθε᾽ ὀπάσσας
Ζεὺς Κρονίδης κατένασσε πατὴρ ἐς πείρατα γαίης.

Once again Zeus the son of Kronos made another race, the fourth,
on the much nourishing earth, more just and better,
the divine race of heroic men, who are called
hēmitheoi, the generation previous to ours on the boundless earth.
Evil war and dread battle destroyed even them,
some beneath seven-gated Thebes in the Kadmean land,
fighting over the flocks of Oidipous,
and others after drawing them in ships over the great gulf of the sea
to Troy for the sake of fair-haired Helen.
And when the end of death covered some over,
Zeus the son of Kronos, the father, settled the others at the ends of the earth,
giving to them a livelihood and haunts apart from men.

In this passage the separation of the heroic generation from Hesiod's iron generation could not be clearer: the heroes are referred to as the "previous generation" (προτέρη γενεὴ, *Works & Days* 160), now destroyed. This generation is different in character from the bronze generation that preceded it—they are "more just and better" (δικαιότερον καὶ ἄρειον, *Works & Days* 158). This separates the *hēmitheoi* from the iron race as well, since a signal problem of this generation is its lack of justice (*Works & Days* 219-26). The heroes are separated from the narrator's here-and-now not just by character and time but also by space. The heroes are settled by Zeus at the ends of the earth (κατένασσε … ἐς πείρατα γαίης, *Works & Days* 168), where they live apart from men (*Works & Days* 169). Zeus' action has separated the heroic generation from the iron generation, and this result is similar to the intended separation of gods from mortals seen in the fragment

from the *Catalogue of Women* quoted above. The wording is in fact very similar: in the *Works and Days*, Zeus gives the heroes "livelihood and haunts apart from men" (τοῖς δὲ δίχ' ἀνθρώπων βίοτον καὶ ἤθε' ὀπάσσας, *Works & Days* 169) and in the *Catalogue*, the intent is for the gods to have "livelihood and haunts apart from men" (χωρ̣ὶς ἀπ' ἀν[θ]ρ̣ώπων̣[βίοτον κα]ὶ̣ ἤθε' ἔχωσιν, 103).

Like the passages from the *Catalogue* and the *Works and Days*, the Iliadic account of the wall's obliteration narrates the close of the heroic age. By the time Apollo and Poseidon plot the wall's destruction the war is over and the surviving heroes have boarded their ships to return home—in other words, the entire poetic tradition of the Trojan War, including the *Nostoi*, is nearly complete. The mention of the death of the *hēmitheōn genos andrōn* makes it clear that this is the end not only of the traditions relating to the Trojan War, but also of the other traditions of heroic poetry, for instance the Theban saga mentioned in the *Catalogue* fragment.

The underlying thematics of the Iliadic passage are the same as those of the Hesiodic passages, but here the wall stands in for the *hēmitheoi*. In fact, the *Iliad* explicitly makes the wall a reminder of fallen heroes: it incorporates a burial mound, a *sēma*, for the Akhaians who have died at Troy (7.336-38).[47] From here it is a short step to say that the wall is a symbol of the *hēmitheoi* generally, and that the wall's removal is parallel to the removal of the heroes from the world of ordinary men. This is true even on the level of diction: Poseidon "covered" the remnants of the Akhaian wall under the sand (ψαμάθοισι κάλυψε, 12.31, cf. 7.462), just as Zeus "concealed" the silver race (ἔκρυψε, *Works & Days* 138) and will one day destroy the iron race (ὀλέσει, *Works &*

47. See Scodel (1982) 48n38, Ford (1992) 150.

Days 180) in the *Works and Days*. It is true that in Hesiod the *hēmitheoi* are the fourth, heroic generation (*Works & Days* 160) and are not said to be "concealed" by Zeus. But some members of this generation are removed to the Islands of the Blessed (*Works & Days* 170-71). This should be seen a positively valued form of concealment, befitting a valorized generation. Odysseus undergoes a similar concealment on the island of Kalypso, the "Concealer" or "Encloser"; as Gregory Crane has discussed, her island is a multiform of the Islands of the Blessed.[48] The Akhaian wall, of course, does not enjoy immortality at the ends of the earth. Instead, its fate more closely resembles the fate of Hesiod's negatively characterized silver and iron generations, and this suggests that the *Iliad* employs a negative conception of the *hēmitheoi*. This passage echoes Poseidon's complaint that the Akhaians did not give hekatombs to the gods (12.6); as a result, the wall is doomed, because it was built against the will of the gods (12.8). As we have seen, this offense replicates Laomedon's dishonoring of Apollo and Poseidon after the construction of the Trojan wall.[49] The association of the *hēmitheoi* with the destruction of the Akhaian wall implies that the faults of the Akhaian and Trojan communities are shared by the entire heroic generation, and for this reason the gods bring the heroic era to a close.

The flood that removes the wall is cosmic in scale, requiring the efforts of three gods to create a deluge which lasts for nine days. The flood is given a local origin: Poseidon and Apollo unite all the rivers that flow from Mount Ida, which are catalogued in several lines (12.19-24). Yet several features of this catalogue suggest that this flood has cosmic significance. As discussed

48. Crane (1988) 15-16.
49. See above, pp. 151-52.

above, the Simoeis is associated with the death of the *hēmitheoi*. The catalogue form itself is of interest here, since it resembles a larger catalogue of rivers in the *Theogony*, in which seven of the eight Trojan rivers listed in Homer appear. It seems clear that both poems are drawing on a common tradition of river catalogues, rather than one depending on the other. The *Iliad*'s short catalogue of the Trojan rivers thus hints at a more comprehensive catalogue of the world's rivers.The mention of the Skamander here also gives the catalogue a cosmic resonance, since in his combat with Akhilleus and then Hephaistos in Book 21, the river represents the elemental force of water itself.

These are merely hints that the Trojan rivers are uniting in a cosmic flood, but the roles of Zeus and Poseidon in this passage make the cosmic scale explicit. Both gods appear less as anthropomorphic deities than forces of nature, and each represents his respective domain—sky and sea. Zeus appears not just as the sky god but as the sky itself: he "rains unceasingly" (ὗε…συνεχές, 12.25-26). The description of Poseidon as "holding his trident in his hands" (ἔχων χείρεσσι τρίαιναν, 12.27) is only apparently a nod towards personification, as the trident signals his connection with the sea in the same way that the thunderbolt shows Zeus as a sky god. Here Poseidon acts as a tidal wave, sending the wall into the sea and covering the shore with sand. Poseidon's epithet ἐννοσίγαιος associates him with the earth and earthquake, but perhaps in this context the epithet might have also suggested an association with tidal waves, since the Greeks may have understood them as a consequence of earthquakes. The Trojan rivers, Zeus' rain, and Poseidon's tidal wave implicate the earth, the sky, and the sea in the flood. Together with the underworld, the realms of earth, sky, and sea form the Homeric cosmos. As Poseidon states in

Book 15 (187-93), the divisions of sky, sea, and the underworld were apportioned by lot to Zeus, Poseidon, and Hades respectively, while the earth and Mount Olympos are common to all. The cosmic scale of the flood that washes away the wall suggests that it has been a disruption not just to the Trojan landscape but to the very order of things. After the wall's removal, order is restored: the beach is smooth and the rivers flow in their normal courses again (12.28-34).

The imagery of a catastrophic flood finds echoes both within the *Iliad* and in other Greek traditions, as well as in flood stories from Near Eastern texts.[50] In the Mesopotamian *Atrahasis*, the gods, annoyed by the noise created by the multiplying crowd of humanity, send a series of calamities to reduce the numbers of people: plague, then drought, and then flood. Infant mortality is instituted as a population control measure after the flood.[51] Tablet XI of the Standard Version of the Epic of Gilgamesh contains a Flood story adapted from (or even excerpted from) the *Atrahasis*, told by Utnapishtim, a survivor of the deluge.[52] Martin West suggests that the *Iliad* here reflects the specific influence of the Gilgamesh epic.[53] In any case, however, in Utnapishtim's account, as in the *Atrahasis*, the flood is brought on by the gods' anger at the activities of men.

The most famous Near Eastern flood myth is, of course, found in *Genesis* (6-8), where the flood is sent to punish the wickedness of men (*Gen*. 6:5-6). The flood of Deucalion is sometimes said to punish human impiety, which is presented either as a general characteristic (ps.-Apollodorus 1.7.2, Ovid *Met*. 1.260-415), or in the specific example of Lykaon, who ate

---

50. See Scodel (1982) 40-46 for the most comprehensive treatment of these parallels.
51. Lambert and Millard (1969) Tablet II.
52. See Tigay (1982) 214-40.
53. West (1999) 377-78. West further suggests that the diversion of rivers to wash the wall away reflects historical accounts of the destruction of Babylon by Sennacherib (378-80).

human flesh (Apollodorus 3.8.2). Deucalion is a son of Prometheus, which links him to the theft of fire, establishment of sacrifice, and creation of Pandora—events that define humanity's status in relation to the gods. Despite the presence of motifs seen in the *Atrahasis* and in the relief-of-the-earth theme, Deucalion's flood is not the epochal event of the Mesopotamian and biblical accounts—it does not create a break between a heroic era and the present-day circumstances of humanity, nor does it signal a separation between gods and men or the establishment of a new relationship between the gods and humanity. The *Iliad*'s combination of a catastrophic flood with the death of the *hēmitheoi*, then, has more in common with Near Eastern flood myths than with the preserved Greek accounts of Deucalion's flood. As such, it perhaps resonated more deeply with those audiences in areas in closer contact with the Near East—that is, those areas where the *Kypria* was considered an authoritative tradition.

In Diomedes' *aristeia* a simile describes him as a river in flood that destroys the "works of men" (5.84-94). As I have illustrated in Chapter Three, this simile is part of a series of river images that depict the ongoing battle in terms of landscape imagery. The destruction of the Akhaian wall transfers the imagery of the earlier river simile to epic reality, which will also occur in Akhilleus' battle with the Skamandros in Book 21. Like the flooding river in the simile, the floods that destroy the Akhaian wall wipes away a mortal construction; unlike that river, this flood restores order.

To sum up, the *Iliad* presents the obliteration of the Akhaian wall as the final event of the heroic age and makes this event a symbol of the removal of the heroes from the earth through catastrophe. The reference to the heroes with the rare term *hēmitheoi* accentuates the sense that

this event brings about a profound break between the time of the heroes and the present day of the poem's audience. This break is accomplished by a cosmic flood, raised by the joint efforts of Zeus, Poseidon, and Apollo, that sweeps the Akhaian wall along with the physical traces of the war left on the battlefield into the sea. This flood is recognizably adapted from Near Eastern myths in which a divinely sent flood punishes human impiety. In the *Iliad*, it is the Akhaian wall that is destroyed because of impiety: its builders failed to offer sacrifices to the gods. This insult to the gods is a sign of a broader pattern of disrespect for the gods endemic to the *hēmitheoi*, who are removed from the earth through the catastrophe of the Trojan War.

Conclusion

Poseidon's outrage at the construction of the Akhaian wall is firmly grounded in a typically Homeric concern for *timē* and *kleos*. The Akhaians build the wall without making sacrifices, even to Poseidon, the guardian of fortification walls. Thus the wall injures the *timē* of all the gods, but especially Poseidon. Moreover, Poseidon complains that the Akhaian wall will destroy the *kleos* of the wall he built for the Trojans. In fact, the Akhaian wall helps perpetuate the memory of the loss of *timē* Poseidon suffered when the Trojan king Laomedon refused to pay the wages he had promised the gods for the construction of the city's wall. The Akhaians' failure to sacrifice for their wall parallels Laomedon's refusal to compensate Poseidon and Apollo. The Akhaian wall thus serves as a reminder of both communities' offenses against Poseidon in particular and the gods in general.

The account of the wall's post-war destruction that opens Book 12 expands the focus from the immediate events of the Trojan War to take in the end of the heroic age. The wall is

swept into the sea by a massive flood raised by Zeus, Poseidon, and Apollo, along with the physical remnants of the battlefield, including the fallen warriors Homer calls the "generation of demigod men" (ἡμιθέων γένος ἀνδρῶν, 12.24). By characterizing the heroes of the Trojan War as *hēmitheoi*, the narrator views them as creatures of an earlier age, living in conditions that differ profoundly from his own time. Usages of the term in Hesiodic poetry elucidate the connotations of this word, and show that the time of the *hēmitheoi* was ended with violent catastrophe. The *Iliad* makes the destruction of the wall the final event of epic tradition; it thus brings an end to the heroic era. The flood that destroys the wall is cosmic in scale, raised by the combined efforts of the gods of sea and sky, Poseidon and Zeus, along with Apollo. This cataclysm is recognizably adapted from Near Eastern flood myths in which a deluge cleanses the earth of impious humanity. The motivation given for the destruction of the Akhaian wall is that it was built against the will of the gods. This implies that the failure to sacrifice after the wall's construction is characteristic of the disrespect of the *hēmitheoi* towards the gods, a failure which results in their destruction and the end of the heroic age.

Chapter Five: The Laughter of Zeus

Book 21 of the *Iliad* contains two of the epic's more unusual episodes. First, the river Skamandros, which so far has only appeared as a body of water, suddenly emerges as a personified feature of the landscape, and takes on Akhilleus in single combat. When the Akhaian hero proves unequal to the task of fighting a river, Hephaistos steps in. The duel between Hephaistos and Skamandros resumes the Theomachy, which had begun at the opening of Book 20, only to be delayed for Akhilleus' *aristeia*. The beginning of the Theomachy (20.1-74) promises a battle affecting the entire cosmos, but for critics ancient and modern, the gods' battle in Book 21 has seemed an absurd anticlimax. Hephaistos' battle with the river has all the majesty and dramatic intensity one might expect from a battle between gods, but some of the ensuing scenes show the gods squabbling like children, and when Hera boxes Artemis' ears with her own bow and arrows (21.489-92), the battle has turned into physical comedy. In his *On the Sublime*, the ancient literary critic Longinus wrote that the episode would be impious unless it was interpreted allegorically.[1] Modern critics have tended to see the Theomachy as a whole as providing comic relief before the true climax of Akhilleus' *aristeia*, his duel with Hektor, or as contrasting the "sublime frivolity" of the gods with the seriousness of mortal experience.[2]

---

1. Longinus 9.7: ἀλλὰ ταῦτα φοβερὰ μέν, πλὴν ἄλλως, εἰ μὴ κατ' ἀλληγορίαν λαμβάνοιτο, παντάπασιν ἄθεα καὶ οὐ σῴζοντα τὸ πρέπον.
2. See Bremmer (1987) 39 for a survey of modern opinions. "Sublime frivolity" is the translation by Jasper Griffin (1980: 199) for Karl Reinhardt's phrase *erhabener Unernst* (1960: 25).

Though these episodes may seem incongruous in the *Iliad*, they are scenes of a type that is at home in epic narratives of how the hierarchy of gods and the cosmos came into being—narratives such as Hesiod's *Theogony*. Akhilleus' battle with the river Skamandros is an example of a narrative pattern known as the combat myth, in which a god or hero fights against a monster who represents chaos.[3] This pattern need not occur as part of a theogonic narrative. But in examples from a wide variety of societies, when gods take part in this narrative pattern, it often has to do with the acquisition or maintenance of divine kingship. In a theogonic narrative, theomachy also has to do with a god either establishing himself as the head of the pantheon, or defending his position against a challenger.[4] But in Book 21 Zeus' power is not at stake, nor is Akhilleus presented as in any way seeking to replace Zeus at the head of the Olympians. Instead, the *Iliad* has adapted these episodes to emphasize precisely this point, that at this stage in the evolution of the cosmos, no serious challenge to Zeus' authority is possible. The poem raises the spectre of divine succession only to emphatically quash it. In fact, those who are the most logical candidates to challenge Zeus—Akhilleus, who would have replaced Zeus if Thetis had not been married off to a mortal, and the trio of Poseidon, Hera, and Athene, who once attempted to overthrow Zeus, only to be thwarted by the intervention of Thetis—instead embrace and support Zeus' authority in these scenes.

In my first three chapters, I showed how the *Iliad* evokes the prehistory of the Trojan War to raise the possibility that the fighting at Troy will lead to cosmic destabilization and the

---

3. On the adversary in the combat myth as a representation of chaos, see Fontenrose (1959) and Watkins (1995) 299-300.
4. See Fontenrose (1959) 439-47 and Louden (2006) 213.

intensification of strife among the gods, which implicitly threatens Zeus' rule. In Chapter Four, I argued that the post war destruction of the Akhaian wall by a cosmic flood symbolizes the removal of the *hēmitheoi* from the earth for their failure to pay appropriate respect for the gods; this is a proleptic glimpse of the resolution of the threat that the war poses to the stability of Zeus' rule. The River-fight and the Theomachy portray the resolution of this danger within the primary fabula of the *Iliad* through a demonstration that at this point in the evolution of the cosmos, a threat to Zeus' supremacy can be intimated, but an open rebellion cannot be seriously presented.

The River-Fight (21.205-327)

Akhilleus' confrontation with the river Skamandros pits the hero against an element of the Trojan landscape itself. As the episode progresses and Hephaistos takes Akhilleus' place in opposing Skamandros, the battle transforms into an elemental conflict, with Hephaistos representing fire and Skamandros no longer being an individual river, but the force of water itself. This episode is a combat myth—a narrative pattern diffused widely throughout Near Eastern and Indo-European mythology, in which a god or hero comes into conflict with a monstrous, serpentine adversary, often referred to as a dragon.[5] After briefly summarizing Akhilleus' battle with the river, I compare three extra-Homeric examples of this pattern. Two examples are chosen from Near Eastern texts, Marduk's confrontation with Tiamat in the *Enuma Elish* and Baal's battle against Yam in Ugaritic myth. The third example, Zeus' battle with Typhoeus, is Greek, though it

5. On the river-fight as a combat myth, see Forsyth (1987) 82, Mondi (1990) 181, Nagler (1974) 147-66. On the combat myth generally, see Fontenrose (1959), Forsyth (1987), and Watkins (1995).

has marked affinities with Near Eastern myth. This comparison will demonstrate that indeed, Akhilleus' fight against Skamandros follows the pattern of these combat myths. Yet Akhilleus is a highly ambiguous figure who in many ways is a force of chaos himself. Earlier depictions of the Akhaians as forces of disorder reinforce this depiction of Akhilleus as a kind of chaotic monster. Another reason for Akhilleus to figure as adversary in the combat myth is his never to be realized potential for overthrowing Zeus, forestalled because Thetis married Peleus rather than Zeus. Were the *Iliad* a theogony, the river fight would be the scene in which Akhilleus the son of Zeus would overthrow his father and enthrone himself as ruler of the cosmos. But this scenario cannot be overtly expressed in the *Iliad*. Instead Akhilleus proves unequal to a fight with Skamandros. He must be rescued by a god, Hephaistos, who is himself a true son of Zeus.

At the beginning of the episode, Akhilleus is on the banks of the Skamandros slaying Paiones, after having killed their leader Asteropaios, the son of the river Axios. Skamandros commands Akhilleus to drive the Paiones away from the riverbank and to do his killing on the plain, since corpses have blocked the river's flow to the sea. Akhilleus agrees, but then rushes upon the Trojans. Skamandros rebukes Apollo for failing to obey Zeus' command to defend the Trojans. Akhilleus leaps into the river, presumably to drive out the Trojans, and the river now rises up, overflowing his banks and casting the dead onto the plain, "bellowing like a bull" (μεμυκὼς ἠΰτε ταῦρος, 21.237).[6] Akhilleus flees from the river onto the plain, and the river pursues him. Despite Akhilleus' fleetness of foot, he is outpaced by the river, and is on the point

6. The characterization of rivers as taurine is common, e.g. Sophocles *Trachiniae* 11-12 φοιτῶν ἐναργὴς ταῦρος, ἄλλοτ' αἰόλος / δράκων ἑλικτός, on which see Jebb (1908) *ad loc.*

of being drowned when he makes an appeal to Zeus for aid. Poseidon and Athene appear at Akhilleus' side; Poseidon encourages him and Athene gives him great strength (μέγα...σθένος, 21.304). But Skamandros still pursues Akhilleus, and is on the point of overwhelming him, when Hera encourages Hephaistos to enter the fight. With a blast of fire, Hephaistos dries the plain and burns the corpses that Skamandros has cast out, as well as the vegetation on the river's banks; when Hephaistos turns his fire against the river itself, Skamandros begs Hephaistos to "cease from strife" (λῆγ' ἔριδος, 21.359). Hephaistos continues to burn the river, who then promises to Hera that he will refrain from battle, and swears that he will not defend Troy, even when it is burnt by the Akhaians.

Akhilleus' conflict with the river is an example of a widespread type of mythic narrative known as the combat myth, found in many narratives throughout the Near East and Indo-European world. I will briefly survey three examples of this pattern to bring out some features shared between these examples and Akhilleus' confrontation with Skamandros. The first two examples of the combat myth come from the Near East—first, the *Enuma Elish*, from Babylon, and then Canaanite texts narrating the exploits of the god Baal. In each, a storm-god establishes his position at the head of the divine pantheon through a struggle with an opposing god who personifies the sea. The Bablyonian epic known as the *Enuma Elish* from its incipit (sometimes also called the *Epic of Creation*) probably dates to the early second millennium BCE.[7] It narrates the creation of the world from its very beginnings, but the main concern of the poem is the defeat of Tiamat by the storm-god Marduk. Tiamat is the primeval salt waters, one of the first

7. Dalley (1989) 228-29.

living beings, and the mother of the first generation of gods (a comparable figure is Gaia in the *Theogony*). In the course of the poem, Tiamat becomes a rebel against the established order, and she gives birth to eleven types of monsters whom she leads against the ruling gods. After a series of gods try to face Tiamat and shrink away in fear, Marduk is selected as a champion, on the condition that he be given kingship over the gods if he succeeds. Armed with a variety of weapons—bow and arrows, mace, net, thunderbolt, and storm winds—Marduk mounts his chariot and meets Tiamat in combat. Marduk encircles Tiamat with a net, and causes Tiamat's belly to bloat by filling her with one of his winds:[8]

> Fierce winds distended her belly,
> Her insides were constipated and she stretched her mouth wide.
> He shot an arrow which pierced her belly,
> Split her down the middle and slit her heart,
> Vanquished her and extinguished out her life.
> He threw down her corpse and stood on top of her.

When Tiamat opens her mouth "to devour" Marduk uses the winds to keep her mouth open and shoots her in the belly with arrows, killing her. Marduk proceeds to split her body in two, forming the heavens and earth with the halves; he then sets the sun, moon, and stars in their appointed courses:[9]

> He fashioned stands for the great gods.
> As for the stars, he set up constellations corresponding to them.
> He designated the year and marked out its divisions,
> Apportioned three stars each to the twelve months.

A closely related narrative is the combat of the storm-god Baal and his adversary Yam, known to us through Canaanite texts found at the Bronze Age site of Ugarit, a city located near

8. *Epic of Creation* IV, trans. Dalley (1989) 253.
9. *Epic of Creation* V, trans. Dalley (1989) 255.

the coast of present-day Syria. The texts date from the mid-14th century BCE, but show signs of oral composition and so likely preserve traditions that predate the time when they were written down; Frank Cross has suggested that the material dealt with here was composed no later than 1800-1500 BCE.[10] These texts provide us with an epic, or perhaps a cycle of poems, concerning the deeds of Baal and his consort Anat, but the fragmentary nature of the texts makes reconstruction of the whole, whether epic or cycle, difficult. Here, however, I am only concerned with a subset of these texts, relatively well preserved, which deals with the story of Baal's battle with Yam, whose name means "sea."[11] The texts also give him the name Nahar, meaning "river."

As the text begins, Yam sends two messengers to a council of the gods, presided over by El, the father of the gods. Yam demands that Baal be given to him as a captive and that his own (Yam's) lordship be acknowledged. The gods are terrified, and El hands Baal over to Yam. The craftsman god Kothar-and-Khasis then foretells that Baal will triumph over Yam, and gives him two magical clubs named "Chaser" and "Driver." With these clubs, Baal overcomes Yam, and becomes ruler in his place. El then decrees that Kothar-and-Khasis build a palace and temple for Baal on Mt. Zaphon; upon its completion, the gods celebrate.

In both of these narratives a storm god establishes his right to divine kingship through his defeat of the personified sea. In the case of the *Enuma Elish* this battle is part of the creation of the physical universe—after Marduk slays Tiamat, he forms heaven and earth from her body, and he brings further order to the universe through regulating the movements of the sun, moon, and

10. Cross (1973) 113.
11. The Baal-Yam myth occupies two fragmentary tablets (*KTU* 1.1-1.2); for text and translation, see Smith (1994).

stars. The Canaanite texts give no overt sign that Baal's fight with Yam was connected with the physical creation of the universe, and this has generated some scholarly dispute over whether the Baal texts can be understood as having to do with cosmogony, or simply concern a struggle for divine kingship.[12]

Making a too rigid distinction between cosmogonic narratives and those dealing with divine kingship is misguided. Marduk's battle with Tiamat and Baal's battle with Yam are both confrontations between principles of cosmic order and cosmic disorder. In the *Enuma Elish*, Tiamat is an obstacle to the physical ordering of the cosmos: without her defeat, there would be no clear separation of heaven and earth. In the Baal texts, the threat to cosmic order is expressed in political terms—Yam's ascendancy entails the submission of the other gods to his rule. But in each text, creation cannot be said to be truly complete until the ruling god takes his place at the head of the pantheon and his cult is established—since, of course, the cults of Marduk and of Baal shaped the sociopolitical order of the societies who produced these texts.

Zeus' battle with the monster variously known as Typhoeus, Typhaon, or Typhon provides a third example of the combat myth. I have discussed this figure's appearances in Hesiod, the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, and Apollodorus above in Chapter One. Hesiod and Apollodorus both have a substantial narration of the combat, and it will be useful to briefly rehearse these sources in order to draw out features of the pattern they share with the Near Eastern sources discussed above. Hesiod's version of this combat, found in the *Theogony*, is

12. See Forsyth (1987: 49) for the argument that Baal's combat is not a cosmogony. Day (1985: 17) argues that the Canaanites may have associated the world's physical creation with Baal's combats.

straightforward: Typhoeus, a son of Gaia who had a hundred serpentine heads, attacks Zeus, intending to become king of gods and men in his place; but Zeus is able to defeat Typhoeus with his thunderbolt, and casts the monster down onto the earth and then hurls him into Tartaros. The gods then acclaim Zeus as their king, and he distributes various powers (*timai*) among them, and mates with a series of goddesses with whom he engenders various principles of the social order such as Lawfulness, Justice, and Peace (*Theogony* 902). In later Greek texts we find a more complex version of the combat, in which Typhon (as Apollodorus calls him) is temporarily ascendant. According to Apollodorus, Typhon was part man and part beast—down to his thighs, he is human in form (although a hundred dragons' heads spring from his arms); below, he has snaky coils, which when fully extended reach to his head. Typhon is of massive size—as Apollodorus says, "he rose higher than all the mountains and often even scraped the stars with his head" (1.6.3):

> ὡς δ' ἐκράτησαν οἱ θεοὶ τῶν Γιγάντων, Γῆ μᾶλλον χολωθεῖσα μίγνυται Ταρτάρῳ, καὶ γεννᾷ Τυφῶνα ἐν Κιλικίᾳ, μεμιγμένην ἔχοντα φύσιν ἀνδρὸς καὶ θηρίου. οὗτος μὲν καὶ μεγέθει καὶ δυνάμει πάντων διήνεγκεν ὅσους ἐγέννησε Γῆ, ἦν δὲ αὐτῷ τὰ μὲν ἄχρι μηρῶν ἄπλετον μέγεθος ἀνδρόμορφον, ὥστε ὑπερέχειν μὲν πάντων τῶν ὀρῶν, ἡ δὲ κεφαλὴ πολλάκις καὶ τῶν ἄστρων ἔψαυε· χεῖρας δὲ εἶχε τὴν μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν ἑσπέραν ἐκτεινομένην τὴν δὲ ἐπὶ τὰς ἀνατολάς· ἐκ τούτων δὲ ἐξεῖχον ἑκατὸν κεφαλαὶ δρακόντων. τὰ δὲ ἀπὸ μηρῶν σπείρας εἶχεν ὑπερμεγέθεις ἐχιδνῶν, ὧν ὁλκοὶ πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐκτεινόμενοι κορυφὴν συριγμὸν πολὺν ἐξίεσαν.
>
> When the gods had defeated the Giants, Gē, who grew even more enraged, had intercourse with Tartaros and gave birth to Typhon in Kilikia. He was part man and part beast, and in both size and strength he surpassed all the other children of Gē. Down to his thighs he was human in form, but of such immense size that he rose higher than all the mountains and often even scraped the stars with his head. With arms outstretched, he could reach the west on one side and the east on the other; and from his arms there sprang a hundred dragons' heads. From his thighs on down, he had massive coils of vipers, which, when they were fully extended, reached right up to his head and emitted violent hisses.

Typhon attacks heaven, and puts all the gods to flight, save Zeus; the two then meet in single combat at Mount Kasios, in Syria. Zeus pelts him with thunderbolts, and then attacks him at close range with a sickle, but Typhon succeeds in enveloping Zeus in his coils. He cuts away Zeus' sinews and places them in the Korykian Cave in Kilikia under the guard of the dragoness Delphynē. Hermes is able to retrieve the sinews, and with his strength restored, Zeus attacks Typhon by surprise, defeats him, and throws him under Mount Etna. One interesting feature of Apollodorus' version is the location of the initial battle at Mount Kasios; this is the same location as Mt. Zaphon, where a palace is built for Baal after he defeats Yam.[13] The battle between Ullikummi and Teshub was also located at this mountain, called Mount Hazzi in Hurrian-Hittite texts. This is a conspicuous sign of Near Eastern influence, and more particularly Ugaritic influence, upon Apollodorus' version of the myth. As I discussed above in Chapter One, abundant parallels make it clear that Typhon belongs to a widely diffused tradition found throughout the Aegean and Near East. The question of how the myth entered Greece is complex. Calvert Watkins has made a strong argument that the myth was transmitted in Bronze Age Anatolia; the possible presence of a Mycenaean community at Ugarit provides another potential vector of transmission.[14] Probably we should not imagine a single place and time of transmission, but reciprocal exchanges taking place over a long period of time.[15] In Apollodoros' version of the story of Typhoeus and in all the Ugaritic texts, the storm god is temporarily defeated and his

13. Day (1985) 32.
14. Watkins (1996) 448-58.
15. López-Ruiz (2010: 38) suggests we should speak of the circulation of people and ideas, rather than the transmission.

adversary temporarily dominant. Moreover, both Baal and Zeus each require help from another god in order to defeat their enemy and take cosmic kingship.

One difference between Typhoeus and the other enemies discussed here is that Typhoeus, as presented in Hesiod and Apollodorus, has no overt connection with the sea. Robert Mondi has suggested that any affiliation Typhoeus originally had with the sea was displaced by an exclusively Greek association of the monster with elemental fire.[16] Strabo (*Geography* 16.2.7), however, reports that the river Orontes was once named Typhon, indicating an affinity with the watery adversaries of the Near Eastern combat myths covered above. In addition, the consistent emphasis on Typhon's serpentine nature connects him with a class of watery monsters who also have serpentine characteristics. Typhoeus is in fact father to Hydra (*Theogony* 313-15). In a heroic version of the combat myth, Herakles burns Hydra's heads just as Herakles' father Zeus burns the heads of Hydra's father Typhoeus.

When we compare these examples to the Skamandros episode a basic similarity is evident: a hero fights a watery adversary, and indeed one who in his fight with Hephaistos seems to represent the elemental force of water, with Hephaistos playing the part of fire. But certain differences are apparent as well: perhaps the most obvious is that cosmic kingship is not overtly at stake in this story. There are many combat myths in which the protagonist is a hero, not a god, and in which the protagonist fights not to secure or to retain cosmic kingship, but rather to defeat forces which threaten human civilization—for instance, Herakles' battles with the river

16. Mondi (1990) 182-83.

Akheloios and with Hydra. These myths of heroic combat are themselves cosmogonic, as they show the preservation of civilized order in the face of personified chaos.

In apparent contrast to Herakles, the river-fight prefigures the destruction of civilized order, for Skamandros' defeat prefigures the fall of Troy. After he is defeated by Hephaistos, Skamandros pledges not to fight to save the city, even when, as he says, "all Troy blazes, burning in consuming fire" (21.375-76). It is, in fact, possible to see Akhilleus as resembling the adversary in the combat pattern. Michael Nagler has made the point that in many ways Akhilleus is represented as a chaotic force, and Skamandros as a force of order.[17] For all that we can identify Skamandros with the chaotic and primeval power of water, he is also a tutelary deity of Troy, and in this episode he shelters still-living Trojans from Akhilleus by hiding them under his streams (21.238). This benevolence contrasts with Akhilleus' behavior—not only has he killed enough Trojans to prevent the river from flowing to the sea (21.218-21), but he rejects the social bonds that should moderate his savage behavior. Just before the Skamandros episode, Akhilleus rejects the supplication of Lykaon (21.34-135), a Trojan who had successfully supplicated Akhilleus on a previous occasion, before the primary fabula of the *Iliad*, and dined with him in his tent. Lykaon's claims upon the rights of a supplicant and upon commensality do not move Akhilleus, who kills Lykaon and throws his body into the river for the fish and eels to feed upon, denying him a proper burial (21.122-27).[18] Akhilleus' actions amount to a rejection or negation of the social order, aligning him more with the role of the adversary rather than with the hero.

17. Nagler (1974) 152.
18. Akhilleus also flings Asteropaios into the river for the fish and eels to eat (21.203-204).

The portrayal of Akhilleus as a menace to civilized order makes him a possible doublet of Typhoeus, that is, a would be son who challenges the rule of Zeus. Laura Slatkin has demonstrated that the myth of divine succession is of crucial importance for understanding the *Iliad*.[19] Had Zeus not married Thetis off to Peleus in the knowledge that Thetis' son was destined to be mightier than his father, Akhilleus' story would have been a different one. As the episode plays out, however, the battle is one-sided. In fact, the stress is on Akhilleus' attempts to escape (21. 251-56):

> Πηλεΐδης δ' ἀπόρουσεν ὅσον τ' ἐπὶ δουρὸς ἐρωή,
> αἰετοῦ οἴματ' ἔχων μέλανος τοῦ θηρητῆρος,
> ὅς θ' ἅμα κάρτιστός τε καὶ ὤκιστος πετεηνῶν·
> τῷ ἐϊκὼς ἤϊξεν, ἐπὶ στήθεσσι δὲ χαλκὸς
> σμερδαλέον κονάβιζεν· ὕπαιθα δὲ τοῖο λιασθεὶς
> φεῦγ', ὃ δ' ὄπισθε ῥέων ἕπετο μεγάλῳ ὀρυμαγδῷ.
>
> But the son of Peleus rushed back as far as a spear-cast
> with the swoop of a black eagle, the hunter,
> that is both the mightiest and swiftest of winged things.
> Like him he darted, and on his chest the bronze rang terribly,
> and he shrank back under the attack,
> and the river, flowing at his back, followed with a mighty roar.

Akhilleus is simply not equal to the fight, and in a cry to Zeus wishes that he had died at Hektor's hands (21.273-79):

> Ζεῦ πάτερ ὡς οὔ τίς με θεῶν ἐλεεινὸν ὑπέστη
> ἐκ ποταμοῖο σαῶσαι· ἔπειτα δὲ καί τι πάθοιμι.
> ἄλλος δ' οὔ τις μοι τόσον αἴτιος Οὐρανιώνων,
> ἀλλὰ φίλη μήτηρ, ἥ με ψεύδεσσιν ἔθελγεν·
> ἦ μ' ἔφατο Τρώων ὑπὸ τείχεϊ θωρηκτάων
> λαιψηροῖς ὀλέεσθαι Ἀπόλλωνος βελέεσσιν.
> ὥς μ' ὄφελ' Ἕκτωρ κτεῖναι ὃς ἐνθάδε γ' ἔτραφ' ἄριστος·
> τώ κ' ἀγαθὸς μὲν ἔπεφν', ἀγαθὸν δέ κεν ἐξενάριξε·

19. Slatkin (1991).

νῦν δέ με λευγαλέῳ θανάτῳ εἵμαρτο ἁλῶναι
ἐρχθέντ' ἐν μεγάλῳ ποταμῷ ὡς παῖδα συφορβόν,
ὅν ῥά τ' ἔναυλος ἀποέρσῃ χειμῶνι περῶντα.

"Father Zeus, to think that none of the gods brought himself to save pitiable me
from the river! Afterwards let me suffer what I may.
No other of the Ouranian gods is as much to blame
but my mother, who beguiled me with false words.
She said that before the walls of the well-armored Trojans
I would perish by the swift arrows of Apollo.
If only Hektor had slain me, the best man raised here;
then a good man would have been the slayer, and he would have slain a good man.
But now it was decreed for me to be caught by a miserable death
enclosed in a great river like a swineherd boy
whom a torrent sweeps away as he tries to cross a great river."

Michael Nagler has called this speech "the climax of the *Iliad* on its mythic level" in its acknowledgement of the superiority of Zeus.[20] Akhilleus' indignant complaint that none of the gods have come to his aid, coupled with his preference for the destiny his mother foretold him, albeit expressed counterfactually, amounts to an acknowledgement of his place in the order of things. He is not equal to a divine combat, but will require the assistance of gods to survive his fight against the river. Akhilleus goes even further, emphasizing his mortality by wishing he had died an ordinary heroic death at the hands of Hektor. As Herakles reprises his father Zeus's struggle with Hydra's father Typhoeus, Akhilleus thus reprises the struggle of the god whose son he almost was. Had he been, he would have triumphed in divine combat, and become the ruler of the cosmos. As a mortal, he must settle for a heroic combat and a heroic death. His acceptance of a merely heroic destiny is in effect an endorsement of the plan of Zeus.

The Theomachy

20. Nagler (1974) 152.

The second significant instance of an inverted theogonic episode in *Iliad* 21 is the Theomachy (21.383-513), or to be more precise, the Theomachy's continuation. The battle of the gods is elaborately introduced at the beginning of Book 20, but the opposing sides delay their confrontation as Akhilleus enters his *aristeia*. It is only when Akhilleus proves unequal to Skamandros that Hephaistos steps in to face the river and initiates open fighting between the gods. Any scene of gods fighting one another might be termed a theomachy, such as the single combat between Ares and the disguised Athene in Book 5.[21] But in pitting two groups of gods against each other, the Theomachy resembles another scene of mass divine combat, the Titanomachy of the Hesiodic *Theogony*. The contest of the Olympians and Titans is for nothing less than cosmic supremacy, and the battle results in the overthrow of Kronos and the ascendancy of Zeus. In the Iliadic Theomachy, Zeus' supremacy is not at stake; he does not participate in the battle, save to orchestrate it and enjoy it as a spectator. The battle seemingly has no serious consequences for the other gods, and much of the Theomachy is comic in tone. The apparent triviality of the episode has inspired critical objection; Walter Leaf wrote that "[t]he Theomachy is one of the very few passages in the *Iliad* which can be pronounced poetically bad."[22] But humor, or more specifically ridicule, is a crucial element in understanding the Theomachy. By subjecting some of the gods to indignity, Zeus reinforces hierarchy among the gods.

---

21. See Louden (2006) 212-18.
22. Leaf (1900-2) 2.382. See also Taplin (1992) 229-30 for the opinion that the Theomachy is frivolous.

A short examination of the similarities between the Theomachy and the Hesiodic Titanomachy will bolster my argument that the *Iliad* has adapted a theogonic episode, and that despite the difference in tone, the Theomachy is similar to the Titanomachy in its concern for the proper placement of the gods within the divine social hierarchy. The similarities between the theomachian episodes in both poems extend to exact correspondences in phraseology, but this should not be taken as an indication that the *Iliad* alludes directly to the *Theogony*, or vice versa. Instead, both poems are drawing on traditional diction and structures to depict a battle of the gods.[23]

The Theomachy opens as if the battle will involve the entire divine sphere. At the beginning of Book 20, Zeus calls an assembly of all the gods, including all the rivers and nymphs; only Okeanos fails to attend. Zeus commands the assembled gods to openly support whichever side they wish in that day's fighting (20.20-27):

> ἔγνως ἐννοσίγαιε ἐμὴν ἐν στήθεσι βουλὴν
> ὧν ἕνεκα ξυνάγειρα· μέλουσί μοι ὀλλύμενοί περ.
> ἀλλ᾽ ἤτοι μὲν ἐγὼ μενέω πτυχὶ Οὐλύμποιο
> ἥμενος, ἔνθ᾽ ὁρόων φρένα τέρψομαι· οἳ δὲ δὴ ἄλλοι
> ἔρχεσθ᾽ ὅφρ᾽ ἂν ἵκησθε μετὰ Τρῶας καὶ Ἀχαιούς,
> ἀμφοτέροισι δ᾽ ἀρήγεθ᾽ ὅπῃ νόος ἐστὶν ἑκάστου.
> εἰ γὰρ Ἀχιλλεὺς οἷος ἐπὶ Τρώεσσι μαχεῖται
> οὐδὲ μίνυνθ᾽ ἕξουσι ποδώκεα Πηλεΐωνα.
>
> "Earthshaker, you know the plan in my heart
> for which I gathered you together; I care for them, though they die.
> But for my part I will remain seated in a fold of Olympos,
> where I shall delight my mind by watching. But you others
> go until you may come among the Trojans and Akhaians,
> and assist either side in the way that pleases the mind of each.

23. See Edwards (1991) 293-94.

For if Akhilleus fights alone against the Trojans
not even a little while will they hold back the swift-footed son of Peleus.

Though the gods are to participate in the battle, Zeus himself will remain on Olympos, enjoying the show. Even though Zeus has a serious purpose in mind, his words suggest that he is staging this battle for his own amusement.

After the gods have come to the battlefield, they urge the Akhaians and Trojans to battle. In another indication of the Theomachy's universality, thunder and earthquake break out and spread throughout the cosmos (20.54-60):

Ὣς τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους μάκαρες θεοὶ ὀτρύνοντες
σύμβαλον, ἐν δ' αὐτοῖς ἔριδα ῥήγνυντο βαρεῖαν·
δεινὸν δὲ βρόντησε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε
ὑψόθεν· αὐτὰρ νέρθε Ποσειδάων ἐτίναξε
γαῖαν ἀπειρεσίην ὀρέων τ' αἰπεινὰ κάρηνα.
πάντες δ' ἐσσείοντο πόδες πολυπίδακος Ἴδης
καὶ κορυφαί, Τρώων τε πόλις καὶ νῆες Ἀχαιῶν.

So the blessed gods urging on both sides
threw them together, and made oppressive strife break out among them.
The father of gods and men thundered terribly
from above. But below Poseidon shook
the boundless earth and the lofty peaks of the mountains.
All the feet of many-fountained Ida shook,
and the peaks, and the city of the Trojans and the ships of the Akhaians.

In the following lines, Hades fears that Poseidon will split open the earth and lay the underworld open for all to see. This is an instance of what Robert Mondi has called the "Cosmic Disturbance motif," in which each of the divisions of the cosmos—sky, earth, sea, and the underworld—are upset.[24] Here, the sky is represented by Zeus' thunder, the earth is shaken by Poseidon, and the underworld is represented by Hades' fear that Poseidon's earthquake will open his realm to the

24. Mondi (1986) 33-34.

view of all. Homer seems to be preparing the ground for a titanic battle that threatens the stability of the cosmos.

A similar instance of universal disturbance occurs in the Titanomachy (*Theogony* 678-82):

> ...δεινὸν δὲ περίαχε πόντος ἀπείρων,
> γῆ δὲ μέγ᾽ ἐσμαράγησεν, ἐπέστενε δ᾽ οὐρανὸς εὐρὺς
> σειόμενος, πεδόθεν δὲ τινάσσετο μακρὸς Ὄλυμπος
> ῥιπῇ ὕπ᾽ ἀθανάτων, ἔνοσις δ᾽ ἵκανε βαρεῖα
> τάρταρον ἠερόεντα ποδῶν, ...
>
> and the boundless sea shrieked terribly,
> the earth crashed greatly, and the broad heaven groaned,
> quaking, and great Olympos was shaken from its foundations
> at the rush of the immortals, and a deep shaking of feet
> reached misty Tartaros...

Note also line 705, τόσσος δοῦπος ἔγεντο θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνιόντων ("such a noise arose when the gods came together in strife"), which closely resembles the ending of the Iliadic passage—the phrase "when the gods come together in strife" seems to be a generic marker of theomachy.[25] In the Typhoeus episode of the *Theogony*, the divisions of the universe are once again disturbed (839-41, 847-51):

> σκληρὸν δ᾽ ἐβρόντησε καὶ ὄβριμον, ἀμφὶ δὲ γαῖα
> σμερδαλέον κονάβησε καὶ οὐρανὸς εὐρὺς ὕπερθε
> πόντός τ᾽ Ὠκεανοῦ τε ῥοαὶ καὶ τάρταρα γαίης.
>
> He [Zeus] thundered harshly and heavily, and the earth around
> resounded terribly, and the wide heaven above
> and the sea and Ocean's streams and the nether parts of the earth.

> ἕζεε δὲ χθὼν πᾶσα καὶ οὐρανὸς ἠδὲ θάλασσα·
> θυῖε δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἀμφ᾽ ἀκτὰς περί τ᾽ ἀμφί τε κύματα μακρὰ

25. Louden (2006) 212.

ῥιπῇ ὕπ᾽ ἀθανάτων, ἔνοσις δ᾽ ἄσβεστος ὀρώρει·
τρέε δ᾽ Ἀίδης ἐνέροισι καταφθιμένοισιν ἀνάσσων

The whole earth seethed, and sky and sea;
and long waves raged around the headlands round and about
at the rush of the immortals, and a ceaseless shaking arose.
Hades trembled lording it over the shades below...

In the *Theogony*, each instance of cacophony spreading throughout the cosmos signals a battle in which cosmic kingship, and indeed the very structure of the universe, is at stake. The use of the cosmic disturbance motif in the *Iliad* likewise suggests that in this battle the fate of the cosmos is once again at stake.

The *Iliad* does not allude directly to the text of the *Theogony* to signal this event; rather, the cosmic disturbance motif is a conventional way for an epic poet to evoke theogonic themes. Another occurrence of the motif is found at the beginning of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter.* In order to ensnare Persephone, Gaia brings forth a remarkable flower (10-14):

νάρκισσόν θ᾽, ὃν φῦσε δόλον καλυκώπιδι κούρῃ
Γαῖα Διὸς βουλῇσι χαριζομένη πολυδέκτῃ
θαυμαστὸν γανόωντα, σέβας τότε πᾶσιν ἰδέσθαι
ἀθανάτοις τε θεοῖς ἠδὲ θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποις·
τοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ ῥίζης ἑκατὸν κάρα ἐξεπεφύκει,
κῶζ᾽ ἥδιστ᾽ ὀδμή, πᾶς δ᾽ οὐρανὸς εὐρὺς ὕπερθε
γαῖά τε πᾶσ᾽ ἐγέλασσε καὶ ἁλμυρὸν οἶδμα θαλάσσης.

the narcissus, which Gaia grew as a snare for the flower-faced girl
in order to please by the plans of Zeus the Receiver of Many,
a flower marvelous and bright, a wonder for all to see,
for the immortals above and for mortals below.
From its root a hundredfold bloom sprang up
and a sweet odor smelled, and the whole broad heaven above
and the whole earth laughed, and the salty swell of the sea.

As the odor of the narcissus spreads through the universe, it inspires not general thundering and rumbling, but delight and laughter from sky, earth, and sea. The passage from the *Hymn to*

Demeter does not introduce a theomachy, but the narrative of this poem describes a disturbance to and realignment of the relationship between Olympos, earth, and the underworld.[26] Thus, the rapt attention paid by the cosmos to the moment of Persephone's abduction.

As was noted above, the Iliadic Theomachy defies any expectations of an earth-shaking, or cosmos-shaking, battle, and instead plays out as comedy. And the episode has an appreciative internal audience: after Hephaistos' combat with Skamandros ends and the other gods begin to fight, Zeus laughs from his seat on Olympos (21.385-90):

> ἐν δ' ἄλλοισι θεοῖσιν ἔρις πέσε βεβριθυῖα
> ἀργαλέη, δίχα δέ σφιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θυμὸς ἄητο·
> σὺν δ' ἔπεσον μεγάλῳ πατάγῳ, βράχε δ' εὐρεῖα χθών,
> ἀμφὶ δὲ σάλπιγξεν μέγας οὐρανός. ἄϊε δὲ Ζεὺς
> ἥμενος Οὐλύμπῳ· ἐγέλασσε δέ οἱ φίλον ἦτορ
> γηθοσύνῃ, ὅθ' ὁρᾶτο θεοὺς ἔριδι ξυνιόντας.
>
> but on the other gods heavy and dreadful strife fell;
> and in different directions the heart in their breasts was blown.
> Together then they clashed with a mighty din, and the broad earth roared,
> and round about great heaven trumpeted. And Zeus heard it
> as he sat on Olympos, and his heart laughed
> with joy as he saw the gods joining in strife.

Just as at the beginning of the Theomachy in Book 20, strife falls upon the gods, and an awful noise spreads in every part of the cosmos. But Zeus sits apart from the battle, a spectator rather than a participant; this battle will not affect him, except to provide him amusement. Unlike the opening of the Theomachy, where Zeus' thunder resounded throughout the heavens, the only noise he makes now is laughter. Zeus laughs again at the end of the Theomachy, as Artemis, having returned to Olympos in ignominious defeat, weeps at his knees (21.505-10). Zeus seems

26. On which see Clay (1983) 202-65. On the similarity of the stories of Demeter in the *Hymn* and Akhilleus in the *Iliad*, see Lord (1994).

pleased with the show he has staged, even if some literary critics have found fault with the tone of the episode.

One of the most famous instances of laughter in the *Iliad*, the rebuke and beating of Thersites by Odysseus (2.265-75), helps explain why Zeus laughs at the performance he has arranged. The laughter of the Greek army in response to Thersites' beating seems to spring from seeing someone who has stepped outside the bounds of socially acceptable behavior put back in his proper place—in this case, by physical humiliation.[27] In other words, the punishment of social miscreants is a source of laughter. But we can turn this around, and say that laughter—that is, ridicule—is a means of ensuring compliance with social norms.

The social norms at issue in the Theomachy have to do with authority and hierarchy within the family. A particular issue at stake is the proper attitude of members of the younger divine generation toward their elders. When Poseidon commands Apollo to fight against him on behalf of the Trojans, he tells the younger god to strike the first blow; because Poseidon is elder in birth and wiser (ἐπεὶ πρότερος γενόμην καὶ πλείονα οἶδα, 21.440), it would not be appropriate for him to begin the fight. Apollo replies that gods should not fight one another for mortals' sake (21.461-69):

> Τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπεν ἄναξ ἑκάεργος Ἀπόλλων·
> ἐννοσίγαι' οὐκ ἄν με σαόφρονα μυθήσαιο

27. See Griffin (1980) 183-84 and de Ste. Croix (1981) 413. The assumption made by de Ste. Croix any many others that Thersites is part of the *plēthus* and so of a lower social class has been questioned by Marks (2002), who has demonstrated that the *Iliad* represents Thersites as a member of the *basileus* class, as he is depicted in extra-Homeric tradition. This episode thus provides an example of elite competition over relative status among the *aristoi*, rather than the shaming of a commoner.

ἔμμεναι, εἰ δὴ σοί γε βροτῶν ἕνεκα πτολεμίξω
δειλῶν, οἳ φύλλοισιν ἐοικότες ἄλλοτε μέν τε
ζαφλεγέες τελέθουσιν ἀρούρης καρπὸν ἔδοντες,
ἄλλοτε δὲ φθινύθουσιν ἀκήριοι. ἀλλὰ τάχιστα
παυώμεσθα μάχης· οἳ δ' αὐτοὶ δηριαάσθων.
Ὣς ἄρα φωνήσας πάλιν ἐτράπετ'· αἴδετο γάρ ῥα
πατροκασιγνήτοιο μιγήμεναι ἐν παλάμῃσι.

and then Apollo, the lord who works from afar spoke to him:
"Earthshaker, you would not say that I was sound of mind
if I battle with you for the sake of mortals,
wretched creatures, who like leaves at one time
are full of fire, eating the fruit of the field,
and at another waste away, lifeless. But quickly
let us cease from battle, and let them contend."
So then having spoken, he turned back. For he felt shame
to mix in combat with his father's brother.

Apollo's statement of the ephemerality of mortals has been seen as a brief moment of dignity in the mostly comic Theomachy.[28] But what is sometimes overlooked is the additional reason, unspoken by Apollo but supplied by the narrator, that the younger god is unwilling to fight: Apollo was ashamed (*aideto*, 21.468) to come to blows with his uncle.[29] It may be inappropriate for Poseidon, as the older and wiser, to strike the first blow, but it is equally inappropriate for Apollo to initiate the fight against his older relative. Apollo's reluctance to fight with his uncle, and thus to show disrespect, is worth taking seriously. We could expand the stricture slightly, to say that it is shameful for someone to strike a family member of an older generation; on the other hand, for a parent or older relative to strike a child in rebuke does seem socially permissible, at least for the ancient Greeks. This is, in fact, what happens to Artemis. Outraged by Apollo's failure to fight Poseidon, Artemis rebukes her brother. Artemis has failed to recognize the

28. Louden (2006) 216.
29. Though see Griffith (1975) 76 and Richardson (1993) 94.

impropriety of attacking a relative of an older generation, and she is punished as a result. Hera grows angry, and verbally rebukes Artemis, then grabs her wrists and beats her about the ears with her own bow and arrows. This is not a fight between warriors, but an aunt disciplining her unruly niece. And when we next see Artemis, crying in her father's lap, she is called a *kourē* (21.506), emphasizing her status as an eternally young girl.

In between Artemis' chastisement on earth and her weeping on Olympos comes a scene with Hermes and Leto that further emphasizes the importance of proper behavior towards one's aunt. Hermes refuses to fight Leto on the grounds that exchanging blows with the wives of Zeus is "difficult" (ἀργαλέον, 21.498); instead, Leto may boast that she defeated Hermes by might (21.498-501). Hermes has seen the contrasting examples of Apollo and Artemis, and emulates Apollo's decision to respect the stricture against fighting members of the older generation. This decision reverses the logic of the succession myth; whereas in previous eras of the cosmos younger generations strove to displace the older, now the sons of Zeus acknowledge the impropriety of fighting against the older generation.

In Athene's encounters with Ares and Aphrodite the issue at stake is not the respect due members of an older generation, but the relative status of members of the same generation. Athene, Ares, and Aphrodite are all children of Zeus, but each have a different mother (or in Athene's case, none). The fighting between these siblings ranks them in a hierarchy based on martial prowess, much as martial exploits rank mortal warriors. The combat of Athene and Ares in fact follows the conventions of duels between mortals, and this very conventionality argues

against the common classification of this scene as comic.[30] The fight is brief but impressive. Ares strikes first, but his spear thrust is repelled by Athene's aegis, which can resist even Zeus' lightning (21.400-401). It is no surprise that Ares cannot pierce the aegis, but his blow drives Athene backwards (*ἀναχασσαμένη*, 21.402). In response, Athene strikes Ares' neck with a massive boulder and knocks him to the ground; his body is stretched out over seven *plethra* (21.407-409), some seven hundred feet.[31] Ares' massive size indicates that divine combat, though it resembles the fighting of mortals, takes place on an entirely different scale.[32]

While Ares is bested by Athene, he is nonetheless a formidable opponent. Aphrodite, however, is a less impressive adversary. After she enters the fray in an attempt to take Ares away from the battlefield, Athene strikes her on the breasts, knocking her to the ground. This rescue attempt is similar to Aphrodite's rescue of Aineias in Book 5. In both scenes, Aphrodite is defeated without attempting to attack her assailant. In the earlier scene, Aphrodite is wounded by Diomedes' spear; the description of the spear's passage through Aphrodite's robes to strike her on the hand is adapted from descriptions of spears passing through shields and armor.[33] This wound, then, is similar to wounds received by mortals in combat. But the blow she receives from Athene in the Theomachy is no warrior's wound, but a slap. That Aphrodite should be defeated

30. See Louden (2006: 215) on typical elements in the duel; Richardson (1985: 88-89) notes a resemblance to Hektor's duel with Aias in Book 7.
31. On the meaning of *plethra* see Richardson (1985) 89.
32. On the gods' size, see Purves (2006) 203n71. Note, however, Leaf's condemnation of the description of Ares' huge size as an interpolation (1888: 2.338), with the comment "Homer's gods...are not such monsters as this."
33. See Kirk (1985) 2.96. On other typical elements in Aphrodite's wounding in Book 5, see Fenik (1968) 40-41.

by this unmartial blow confirms Zeus' response to her wounding by Diomedes: Aphrodite should not concern herself with warfare, which is the business of Athene and Ares (5.427-30). The events of the Theomachy, then, show Aphrodite as unable to engage in warfare, and far inferior to Athene and Ares. While Ares is clearly no match for Athene, he remains an impressive fighter. The ranking of Athene, Ares, and Aphrodite corresponds to their genetic relationship to Zeus. Athene, whose sole parent is Zeus, dominates her siblings. Next comes Ares, the child of Zeus and his wife Hera, and last comes Aphrodite, daughter of Zeus and Dione.

The Theomachy, then, shows the gods either accepting hierarchical relations within the family or being punished for not respecting them. This contrasts with the disorderly family relations of the gods through much of the *Iliad*. For instance, Hera pursues her own designs against her husband in the *Dios Apatē*. In this episode (14.153-353), Hera seduces Zeus and causes him to fall asleep, ensuring that his attention will be diverted from the battlefield. Before Hera's successful beguilement of her husband, Poseidon comes to the battlefield in disguise and gives clandestine assistance to the Greeks; after Zeus sleeps, Poseidon assists the Greeks openly. The interventions of Hera and Poseidon enable the Greeks to gain the upper hand against the Trojans and so cause the action of the poem to deviate from Zeus' stated plan to honor Akhilleus by giving victory to the Trojans in his absence.[34] The interference with Zeus' will by Poseidon and Hera, as well as by Athene in Book 8,[35] echoes a pre-Iliadic attempt at regime change carried

34. Thetis describes this plan in her supplication to Zeus at 1.505-10. See Friedman (2001) on the derailment of Zeus' plan caused by Poseidon and Hera in Books 13-15.
35. On Athene's rebellious actions in Book 8, see Kelly (2007) 423.

out by these three gods; only the intercession of Thetis saved Zeus from being overthrown.[36] Overstepping one's role in the divine family, interfering with Zeus' plans, and attempting to overthrow Zeus are parallel acts of disorder. Indeed, when Zeus puts an end to Poseidon's assistance to the Akhaians, his warning to Poseidon cites birth order as one reason why the sea god should give way (γενεῇ πρότερος, 15.166, 182). While he grudgingly agrees to leave the battlefield, Poseidon implicitly disputes the link between birth priority and supremacy, arguing that he and Zeus are (or should be) equals because they have been allotted equal shares of the cosmos (15.187-93, 209). In this exchange, Zeus explicitly links family hierarchy and cosmic supremacy, whereas Poseidon tries to assert an alternative model in which he and Zeus are equals.

Through much of the *Iliad*, Poseidon, Hera, and Athene work against the designs of Zeus, and so foster disorder within the family, the political sphere, and the cosmos. But in the Theomachy, these three gods take the lead in enforcing hierarchical relations among the Olympians. Athene puts Ares and Aphrodite in their respective places, and Hera punishes Artemis for her failure to recognize the impropriety of attacking a member of an older generation. When Poseidon commands Apollo to begin their combat with the justification that it would be inappropriate to strike the first blow himself, since he is older and wiser (ἐπεὶ πρότερος

36. Akhilleus recalls Thetis' rescue of Zeus from this conspiracy at 1.397-406. This story has been taken as an invention to explain the support of Poseidon, Hera, and Athena for the Akhaians (see Willcock 1964: 143-44 and Kirk 1985: 94). Lang (1983: 153-54) argues that the story is traditional. For my purposes, it is not important whether the story is traditional or an *ad hoc* invention; in either case, the story makes a link between the gods' action in the poem and a previous attempt to overthrow Zeus (on this point see Kelly 2007: 422).

γενόμην καὶ πλείονα οἶδα, 21.440), he echoes Zeus' mention of birth order as a reason that Poseidon should yield to him. Poseidon's reuse of Zeus' argument marks a shift in the sea god's attitude towards relations within the Olympian family; whereas he earlier rejected Zeus' argument that birth priority conferred greater power, he now asserts that his status as an elder relative means that Apollo should strike the first blow. Poseidon's support of a normative family hierarchy among the Olympian gods, along with that of Athene and Hera, implicitly supports the supremacy of the god who occupies its apex. When Zeus' wives, siblings, and children fulfill their proper roles, whether by choice or force, they buttress his patriarchal domination of the Olympian family, and in so doing they also support his political and cosmic authority.[37]

In a theogonic context, a theomachy is a challenge for cosmic supremacy. For instance, in the Hesiodic Titanomachy Zeus wins power for himself by displacing Kronos and the Titans. The Titanomachy is largely a war of a younger generation versus an older, though Zeus' ability to forge alliances with select members of older generations proves crucial to his success. In the Iliadic Theomachy, however, there is no hint of a serious challenge to Zeus' rule. Instead, the family hierarchy which underpins Zeus' dominance of the Olympians and of the cosmos is defended by the very gods who once tried to displace the father of gods and men. Critics who have dismissed the Theomachy as trivial or seen the "sublime frivolity" of the gods as a foil for the seriousness of mortal experience have overlooked an important comedic dimension of the

37. Calhoun (1935) argues that the Homeric poems depict Zeus' authority as patriarchal, rather than regal; that is, his power is as a father and head of household, rather than as a king. See Burkert (2004) 25 and Allan (2006) 31 on the depiction of the Olympians as a family; see also Arthur (1982: 64) on the identity of the realms of family, politics, and cosmos in the *Theogony*.

episode's structure. Comic plots move "toward harmony, reconciliation, happiness."[38] The cooperation of Poseidon, Hera, and Athene in confirming the hierarchical arrangement of the gods brings to an end a time of disorder within Olympian society and affirms the patriarchal authority of Zeus. The investment of the gods in the war and consequently, their repeated interventions on the battlefield, have posed a threat to the stability of Zeus' reign, as I showed in Chapter Three. Chapter Four showed the *Iliad*'s proleptic resolution of this threat through its depiction of the destruction of the Akhaian wall after the conclusion of the war. Finally, this chapter has shown how, within the primary fabula of the poem, the River-fight and the Theomachy portray the resolution of the threat to Zeus' rule through a double demonstration that at this point in the evolution of the cosmos, the idea of open rebellion against the supremacy of Zeus can be intimated, but not seriously entertained.

38. Nelson (1990) 2, also 19-40; see also Frye (1957) 43-49 on social integration as the theme of comedy. On the reestablishment of the father's authority as a comedy's resolution, see McCarthy (2000) 124.

Conclusion

This dissertation has explored the *Iliad*'s depiction of the Trojan landscape, demonstrating that the representation of the Troad and the Akhaians' interactions with it allude to extra-Homeric traditions of the Trojan War, to cosmogonic myth, and to myths of divine succession. I have argued that through these allusions the *Iliad* locates its story and the Trojan War more generally within a larger cosmogonic history. The war's origins lie in the struggles over generational succession among the gods, and the conflict at Troy threatens to destabilize the realm of the gods, as their entanglements with their mortal favorites and their competition for status among themselves perpetuates divine strife. Ultimately, Zeus' cosmic authority is affirmed, and the Trojan War is revealed as an essential step in establishing the settled order of the cosmos.

The introduction to the dissertation begins by looking at traditions that Zeus planned the Trojan War to relieve the overburdened earth from overpopulation. In these traditions, overpopulation stems from the cycle of generational succession among the gods, and so overpopulation is intrinsically linked to a larger picture of the development of the cosmos. Its causes can be traced back to the very beginnings of things, as a superabundance of the procreative energies that propelled the growth and development of the early universe. The motif of the overburdened earth is thus intertwined with cosmogonic myth and myths of divine succession. We see that the Iliadic portrayal of the Trojan landscape creates a network of allusion

which sometimes evokes these interrelated traditions individually and sometimes in combination.

Chapter One focuses on the Typhoeus similes that occur in Book Two of the *Iliad*, immediately following the Catalog of Ships (2.780-84). These similes provide a first example of the *Iliad*'s combined allusions, which evoke the suffering of the overburdened earth through their mention of the earth's groaning under the Akhaians' feet and also, through the figure of Typhoeus, the succession myth. The language and imagery of the similes recall the central episode of Typhoeus' mythology, his combat with Zeus. They thus suggest that the conflict between the Akhaians and Trojans is similar to that between Zeus and Typhoeus, but do so in a pointedly ambiguous fashion that allows for two diametrically opposed interpretations of the similes. On one understanding of the similes, the Akhaians are like Zeus, punishing the faithless Trojans, whose disrespect for social obligations such as oaths and *xeniē* render them forces of disorder. On the second, the Akhaians resemble Typhoeus, and are themselves a threat to cosmic order.

Chapter Two examines the depiction of the opposing forces in the first battle narrative of the *Iliad* (4.422-6.35), to further demonstrate the poem's representation of the Akhaians as forces of disorder. This section of the *Iliad* reinforces this portrayal of the Akhaians by assimilating both the Akhaians and the Trojans to the landscape, so that on the metaphorical plane, the battle is between opposing forces of nature. An association between the Akhaians and the sea is matched by one between the Trojans and rivers, reflecting a pattern throughout the *Iliad* in which the Akhaians and Trojans are assimilated to salt and fresh water respectively. The

Iliad's water imagery thus portrays the Trojan War as a new outbreak of a primeval conflict between salt and fresh water. In both Near Eastern and Greek myth the sea appears as a chaotic force and a threat to cosmic order. I argue that the Akhaians' alignment with salt waters thus implies that the Akhaians also constitute a disruptive threat to the order of things. In tandem with this picture of elemental strife, this section of the *Iliad* shows individual Akhaian warriors attacking individual Trojans who are so closely linked with the landscape as to personify its features. This figurative combat both anticipates the actual combat with the landscape that occurs in Akhilleus' battle with the river Skamandros in Book 21, and also echoes the cause of the Trojan War found in extra-Homeric accounts such as the *Kypria*: the weighing down of the earth by humanity.

Chapter Three shows how Diomedes' *aristeia* in Book 5 illustrates the threat to the divine order that the Akhaians represent. In fighting against and wounding gods, Diomedes threatens to become the gods' equal, and so to transgress the categorical distinction between mortal and immortal. My analysis makes it clear that Athene's support for Diomedes' exploits demonstrates both that the divine community of gods is internally divided and that the gods' involvement with heroes threatens the perpetual renewal of divine strife. Even Zeus himself is caught up in strife, and allows his wrath towards Ares to disupt his plan to honor Akhilleus by giving temporary victory to the Trojans.

In the central books of the poem, the most prominent feature of the Trojan landscape is the fortification wall that protects the Akhaian camp and ships. In Chapter Four, I show that the *Iliad*'s depictions of the wall, its history, and its destruction evoke Near Eastern myths of

overpopulation and its resolution through a catastrophic deluge. This portrayal of the Akhaian wall poses the destruction of the heroic generation, accomplished in part by the Trojan War, as divinely sent punishment for impiety. The wall is built without sacrifice to the gods (7.446-53), which causes an injury to the gods' *timē*, particularly that of Poseidon. This offense echoes an earlier episode of Troy's history, when Laomedon refused to compensate Poseidon and Apollo for the construction of the city walls of Troy. The Akhaian wall is thus a doublet of the Trojan wall, and both are created without proper regard for the gods. The account of the wall's post-war destruction by the united efforts of Zeus, Poseidon, and Apollo (12.1-33) implies that the impiety that attended the construction of the Akhaian and Trojan walls is a characteristic of the entire heroic generation. The catastrophic flood that washes away the wall parallels the deluge in Near Eastern flood myths sent to relieve the overburdened earth of its unruly human population. But instead of visiting destruction upon humanity, the *Iliad*'s flood carries away the physical traces of the "generation of demigod men" (ἡμιθέων γένος ἀνδρῶν, 12.24).

The dissertation's fifth chapter treats a final example of the *Iliad*'s incorporation of extra-Homeric tradition by examining two episodes of Book 21—Akhilleus' battle with the river Skamandros (21.205-327) and the ensuing scenes of combat between gods (21.383-513). Both episodes are instances of narrative patterns that are found in epic narratives concerning how the hierarchy of gods and the cosmos came into being, such as Hesiod's *Theogony*. In a theogonic context, episodes of these types portray a challenge for cosmic supremacy, but in Book 21 there is no serious challenge to Zeus' power. Instead, the episodes affirm the social and cosmic hierarchy which undergirds Zeus' rule and show that at this stage in the evolution of the cosmos,

no serious challenge to Zeus' authority is possible. On the first day of battle, the Akhaians make a figurative assault on the Trojan landscape; now, the best of the Akhaians confronts personified nature in the form of Troy's tutelary river. The river-fight is an echo of Zeus' combat with Typhoeus, and of the widespread pattern of the combat myth, which pits a champion of cosmic order against a chaotic adversary. But through their assimilation with the sea and their likeness to Typhoeus, the Akhaians have been portrayed as chaotic forces themselves; this, together with his transgressive behavior following the death of Patroklos, raises the possibility that Akhilleus may play the role of the chaos demon. As the combat turns out, however, Akhilleus is no match for the river, and appeals to Zeus for aid. This acknowledgement of dependence upon and subordination to Zeus aligns Akhilleus with the god who would have been his father, and makes his struggle a reprise of Zeus' struggle. Rather than following the model of a filial figure who attempts to rival his father, Akhilleus becomes a loyal son. Akhilleus goes from a Typhoean figure to an Apolline one. The river-fight is brought to a close when Hephaistos comes to Akhilleus' aid and burns the river with fire. Scenes of open combat between gods follow, some of which are playful and humorous in tone. The gods humiliate and ridicule one another, and Zeus laughs at the spectacle he himself has commanded. Here, humor ensures that the gods maintain their proper place within the extended family structure of the Olympian gods; observing one's proper role as an aunt, nephew, and so on supports Zeus' patriarchal control over his family, and at the same time reinforces his cosmic supremacy. Both these episodes, the river-fight and the Theomachy, show the solidification of cosmic order through the affirmation of social hierarchy based on familial relations.

The landscape of Troy not only provides the *Iliad* with a vividly imagined setting for its action, but also locates the epic within a "wider mythological terrain."[1] I have shown how the Trojan landscape is a locus of allusion to extra-Homeric traditions about the origins of the Trojan War and the origins and evolution of the cosmos, and how the reverberation of these traditions within the *Iliad* incorporates the epic into that process of cosmogony. Even as Homer's epic of the Trojan War recounts the struggle of the Akhaians and Trojans before the walls of Troy, and the withdrawal and reintegration of the hero Akhilleus, so too it retells how the enduring order of the universe came to be, a stable hierarchy based on the rule of Zeus, by whose plan the earth is relieved both of her theogonic labors and also the burden of human overpopulation.

1. Slatkin (1991) 108.

Bibliography

Abbreviations:

ANET = J. B. Pritchard, ed. 1969. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. 3rd ed. with supplement. Princeton.

CTH = E. Laroche. 1971. *Catalogue des Texts Hittites*. Paris.

FGrHist = F. Jacoby. 1923–1958. *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker.* Berlin/Leiden.

IE. = Ed. H. Engelmann and R. Merkelbach. 1972-74. *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai*. Bonn.

KTU = M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartin. 1976. *Die Keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit einschliesslich der keilalphabetischen Text ausserhalb Ugarits*. Vol. 1. Kevelaer.

LSJ = H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. S. Jones. 1925-1940. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford.

Adkins, Arthur. 1969. "Threatening, Abusing, and Feeling Angry in the Homeric Poems." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 89:7-21.

Alden, Maureen J. 2000. *Homer Beside Himself: Para-narratives in the Iliad*. Oxford.

Allan, William. 2006. "Divine Justice and Cosmic Order in Early Greek Epic." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 126:1-35.

Ameis, Carl and C. Hentze. 1906, repr. 1965. *Ilias für den Schulgebrauch*. Leipzig.

Andersen, Øvind. 1998. "Allusion and the Audience of Homer." In *Homerica. Proceedings of the 8th International Symposium on the Odyssey (1-5 September 1996)*. Ed. M. Païsi-Apostolopoulou. Ithaca, Greece. 137-49.

Andersson, Theodore M. 1976. *Early Epic Scenery: Homer, Virgil, and the Medieval Legacy*. Ithaca.

Arend, Walter. 1933. *Die Typischen Scenen bei Homer*. Berlin.

Armstrong, James I. 1958. "The Arming Motif in the *Iliad*." *American Journal of Philology* 79:337-354.

Arthur, Marilyn. 1982. “Cultural Strategies in Hesiod’s *Theogony*: Law, Family, Society.” *Arethusa* 15:63-82.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1986. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Austin.

Barnett, R.D. 1945. “The Epic of Kumarbi and the *Theogony* of Hesiod.” *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 65:100-101.

Beckman, Gary M. 1982. “The Anatolian Myth of Illuyanka.” *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 14:11-25.

Bernabé, Alberto. 1996. *Poetarum epicorum Graecorum: Testimonia et fragmenta pars 1*. Leipzig.

Bremer, Jan M. 1987.“The So-Called Gotterapparat in *Iliad* XX-XXII. In *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry.* Ed. J. M.Bremer, I.J.F. de Jong, and J. Kalff.Amsterdam.

Burgess, Jonathan S. 2001. *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle*. Baltimore.

———. 2006. “Neoanalysis, Orality, and Intertextuality: An Examination of Homeric Motif Transference.” *Oral Tradition* 21:148-189.

———. 2009. *The Death and Afterlife of Achilles*. Baltimore.

Burkert, Walter. 1979. *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual*. Berkeley.

———. 1985. *Greek Religion*. Cambridge, Mass.

———. 1986. “Oriental and Greek Mythology: The Meeting of Parallels.” In *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*. Ed. J. Bremmer. Totowa, N. J.

———. 1992. *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age*. Trans. M. Pinder and W. Burkert. Cambridge, Mass.

———. 2004. *Babylon, Memphis, Persepolis: Eastern Contexts of Greek Culture.* Cambridge, Mass.

Buttmann, Philip. 1861. *Lexilogus, or a Critical Examination of the Meaning and Etymology of Numerous Greek Words and Passages, Intended Principally for Homer and Hesiod*. Ed. and trans. J. R. Fishlake. London.

Byron, George Gordon, Baron. 1978. *Byron's Letters and Journals. Vol. 8: 'Born for Opposition'.* Ed. Leslie A. Marchand. Cambridge, Mass.

Calame, Claude. 2003. *Myth and History in Ancient Greece: The Symbolic Creation of a Colony*. Princeton.

Calhoun, George M. 1935. “Zeus the Father in Homer.” *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*. 66:1-17.

Campbell, Thomas. 1819. *Specimens of the British Poets; With Biographical and Critical Notices, and an Essay on English Poetry.* 7 vols. London.

Clarke, Michael J. 2006. “‘Heart-Cutting Talk’: Homeric κερτομέω and Related Words.” *Classical Quarterly* 51:329-38.

Clay, Jenny Strauss. 1972. “The Planktai and Moly: Divine Naming and Knowing in Homer.” *Hermes* 100:127-31.

———. 1983. *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the Odyssey*. Princeton.

———. 1989. *The Politics of Olympus: Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns*. Princeton.

———. 1999a. “The Whip and Will of Zeus.” *Literary Imagination* 1:40-60.

———. 1999b. “*Iliad* 24.649 and the Semantics of ΚΕΡΤΟΜΕΩ.” *Classical Quarterly* 49:618-21.

———. 2003. *Hesiod’s Cosmos*. Cambridge.

———. 2005. “The beginning and the end of the *Catalogue of Women* and its relation to Hesiod.” In *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*. Ed. R. Hunter. Cambridge. 25-34

———. 2007. “Homer’s Trojan Theater.” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 127:233-52.

Cook, Erwin F. 1995. *The Odyssey in Athens: Myths of Cultural Origins*. Ithaca, N. Y.

———. 1999. “Active and Passive Heroics in the *Odyssey*.” *Classical World* 93:149-67.

———. 2003. "Agamemnon's Test of the Army in *Iliad* Book 2 and the Function of Homeric *akhos*." *American Journal of Philology* 124:165-198.

———. 2009. “On the Importance of *Iliad* 8.” *Classical Philology* 104:133-61.

Cooper, Fiona. 2006. *The Black Poplar: History, Ecology and Conservation*. Bollington, UK.

Crane, Gregory. 1988. *Calypso: Backgrounds and Conventions of the Odyssey*. Frankfurt am Main.

Crielaard, J. P. 1995. "Homer, History, and Archaeology: Some Remarks on the Date of the Homeric World." In *Homeric Questions: Essays in Philology, Ancient History, and Archaeology*. Ed. J. Crielaard. Amsterdam. 201-88.

Cross, Frank M. 1973. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, Mass.

Csapo, Eric. 2005. *Theories of Mythology*. London.

Dalley, Stephanie, trans. 1988. *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others*. Oxford.

Danek, Georg. 1988. *Sudien zur Dolonie*. Vienna.

———. 2002. "Traditional Referentiality and Homeric Intertextuality." In *Omero tremila anni dopo: Atti del Congresso di Genova, 6-8 Luglio 2000*. Ed. F. Montanari. Rome. 3-19.

Day, John. 1985. *God's Battle with the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament*. Cambridge.

Detienne, Marcel and Vernant, Jean-Pierre. 1991. *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society*. Trans. J. Lloyd. Chicago.

Dougherty, Carol. 1993. *The Poetics of Colonization*. Oxford.

Donlan, Walter. 1997. "The Homeric Economy." In *A New Companion to Homer*. Ed. I. Morris and B. Powell. Leiden.

Dornseiff, F. 1933. *Die archaische Mythenerzählung*. Berlin.

Durrbach, Félix. 1926. *Inscriptions de Délos*. Paris.

Edwards, Mark W. 1987. *Homer: Poet of the Iliad*. Baltimore.

———. 1991. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. *Volume* 5: *Books 17–20*. Cambridge.

Else, Gerald F. 1957. *Aristotle's Poetics: The Argument*. Cambridge, Mass.

Fenik, Bernard. 1968. *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad: Studies in the Narrative Technicques of Homeric Battle Description*. Wiesbaden.

Fenno, Jonathan. 2005. ""A Great Wave Against the Stream": Water Imagery in Iliadic Battle Scenes." *American Journal of Philology* 126:475-504.

Finley, Moses I. 1978. *The World of Odysseus*. Rev. ed. New York.

Fontenrose, Joseph. 1959. *Python: A Study of Delphic Myth and Its Origins*. Berkeley.

Ford, Andrew. 1992. *Homer: The Poetry of the Past*. Ithaca, N. Y.

Forsyth, Neil. 1987. *The Old Enemy: Satan and the Combat Myth*. Princeton.

Friedman, Rachel. 2001. "Divine Dissension and the Narrative of the *Iliad*." *Helios* 28:99-118.

Frye, Northrup. 1957. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton.

Gantz, Timothy. 1993. *Early Greek Myth*. Baltimore.

Gatz, Bodo. 1967. *Weltalter, goldene Zeit und sinnverwandte Vorstellungen.* Spudasmata 16.

Genette, Gérard 1980. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Ithaca, N. Y.

Gladstone, William E. 1890. *Landmarks of Homeric Study*. London.

Gottesman, Alex. 2008. "The Pragmatics of Homeric *Kertomia*." *Classical Quarterly* 58:1-12.

Graf, Fritz. 1985. *Nordionische Kulte: religionsgeschichtliche und epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den Kulten von Chios, Erythrai, Klazomenai und Phokaia*. Biblioteca Helvetica Romana 21. Rome.

Graham, A. J. 1964. *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*. Manchester.

Griffin, Jasper. 1980. *Homer on Life and Death*. Oxford.

Griffith, Mark. 1975. "Man and the Leaves: A Study of Mimnermos fr. 2." *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 8:73-88.

Grønbaek, J. H. 1985. "Baal's Battle with Yam: A Canaanite Creation Fight." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 33:27-44.

Güterbock, Hans Gustav. 1948. "The Hittite Version of the Hurrian Kumarbi Myths: Oriental Forerunners of Hesiod." *American Journal of Archaeology* 52:123-34.

Hainsworth, Bryan. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. *Volume 3*: *Books 9-12*. Cambridge.

Hammer, Dean. 2002. *The Iliad as Politics: The Performance of Political Thought.* Norman, Okla.

Heiden, Bruce. 1996. "The Three Movements of the *Iliad*." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 37:5-22.

———. 1998. "The Simile of the Fugitive Homicide, *Iliad* 24.480-84: Analogy, Foiling, and Allusion." *American Journal of Philology* 119:1-10.

Hendel, Ronald S. 1987. "Of Demigods and the Deluge: Toward an Interpretation of Genesis 6:1-4." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106:13-26.

Hirsch, Eric. 1995. "Landscape: Between Place and Space." In *The Anthropology of Landscape: Perspectives on Place and Space*. Ed. E. Hirsch and M. O'Hanlon. Oxford. 1-30.

Hooker, J. T. 1986. "A Residual Problem in *Iliad* 24." *The Classical Quarterly* 36:32-37.

Horrocks, G. 1997. "Homer's Dialect." In *A New Companion to Homer*. Ed I. Morris and B. Powell. Leiden. 193–217.

Jackson, John B. 1997. *Landscape in Sight: Looking at America*. New Haven.

Jackson, Peter. 1989. *Maps of Meaning: An Introduction to Cultural Geography*. Winchester, Mass.

Janko, Richard. 1992. *The Iliad: a Commentary. Volume 4: Books 13-16*. Cambridge.

Janni, Pietro. 1984. *La mappa e il periplo: cartografia antica e spazio odologico*. Rome.

Johnston, Patricia A. 2005. "Volcanoes in Classical Mythology." In *Cultural responses to the volcanic landscape: the Mediterranean and beyond*. Ed. M. Balmuth et al. Boston, Mass. 297-310.

Jones, Michael. 2003. "The Concept of Cultural Landscape: Discourse and Narratives." In *Landscape interfaces: Cultural Heritage in Changing Landscape*. Ed. H. Palang and G. Fry. Dordrecht. 21-52.

Jones, P. V. 1989. "*Iliad* 24.649: Another Solution." *The Classical Quarterly* 39:247-50.

de Jong, Irene J. F. 1987. *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*. Amsterdam.

Kahn, Charles. 1960. *Anaximander and the Origins of Greek Cosmology*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kamptz, Hans von. 1982. *Homerische Personennamen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Kirk, Geoffrey S. 1970. *Myth, Its Meaning and Functions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1985. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume 1*: *Books 1-4*. Cambridge.

———. 1985. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume 2*: *Books 5-8*. Cambridge.

Koenen, Ludwig. 1994. "Greece, the Near East, and Egypt: Cyclic Destruction in Hesiod and the Catalogue of Women." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 124:1-34.

Kullmann, Wolfgang. 1955. "Ein vorhomerisches Motiv im Ilias-proömium." *Philologus* 99:167-92.

———. 1960. *Die Quellen der Ilias (Troischer Sagenkreis)*. Wiesbaden.

———. 1984. "Oral Poetry Theory and Neoanalysis in Homeric Research." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 25:307-23.

Lakoff, George and Turner, Mark. 1989. *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago.

Lambert, W. G. and A. R. Millard. *Atra-ḫasīs: The Babylonian Story of the Flood.* Oxford.

Lang, Mabel. 1983. "Reverberations and Mythology in the *Iliad*." In *Approaches to Homer*. Ed. C. Rubino and C. Shelmerdine. Austin. 140-64.

Lang, Mabel. 1989. "Unreal Conditions in Homeric Narrative." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 30:5-26.

Larson, Jennifer Lynn. 2001. *Greek Nymphs: Myth, Cult, Lore*. Oxford.

Leaf, Walter, ed. 1900-1902. *The Iliad*. 2d ed. 2 vols.

———. 1912. *Troy*. *A Study in Homeric Geography*. London.

Lesky, Albin. 1947. *Thalatta: Der Weg der Griechen zum Meer*. Vienna.

———. 1966. *Gesammelte Schriften. Aufsätze und Reden zu antiker und deutscher Dichtung und Kultur*. Bern.

Lloyd, Michael. 2004. "The Politeness of Achilles: Off-Record Conversation Strategies in Homer and the Meaning of "Kertomia"." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 124:75-89.

López-Ruiz, Carolina. 2010. *When the Gods Were Born: Greek Cosmogonies and the Near East*. Cambridge, Mass.

Lord, Mary L. 1994. "Withdrawal and Return: An Epic Story Pattern in the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* and in the Homeric Poems." In *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter: Translation, Commentary, and Interpretive Essays.* Ed. H. Foley. Princeton.

Louden, Bruce. 1993. "Pivotal Counterfactuals in Homeric Epic." *Arethusa* 12:181-98.

Luce, John V. 1998. *Celebrating Homer's Landscapes: Troy and Ithaca Revisited*. New Haven.

Lynch, Kevin. 1960. *The Image of the City*. Boston: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

Malkin, Irad. 1987. *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece.* Brill.

Marks, James. 2002. "The Junction between the *Kypria* and the *Iliad*." *Phoenix* 56:1-24.

———. 2005 "The Ongoing *Neikos*: Thersites, Odysseus, and Achilleus." *American Journal of Philology* 126:1-31.

Martin, Richard P. 1989. *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad*. Ithaca.

Mayer, Kenneth. 1996. "Helen and the ΔΙΟΣ ΒΟΥΛΗ." *American Journal of Philology* 117:1-15.

McCarthy, Kathleen. 2000. *Slaves, Masters, and the Art of Authority in Plautine Comedy*. Princeton.

Mikalson, Jon. 2005. *Ancient Greek Religion*. Blackwell.

Minchin, Elizabeth. 2001. "Similes in Homer: Image, Mind's Eye, and Memory." In *Speaking Volumes: Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World*. Ed. J. Watson. Leiden. 25-52.

Mondi, Robert. 1989. "Χάος and the Hesiodic Cosmogony." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 92:1-41.

———. 1986. "Tradition and Innovation in the Hesiodic Titanomancy." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 116:25-48.

———. 1990. “Greek Mythic Thought in the Light of the Near East.” In *Approaches to Greek Myth*. Ed. L. Edmunds. Baltimore. 141-198.

Moulton, Carroll. 1977. *Similes in the Homeric Poems*. Göttingen.

Mueller, Martin. 1984. *The Iliad*. London.

Muellner, Leonard. 1990. “The Simile of the Cranes and Pygmies: a Study of Homeric Metaphor.” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 93:59-101.

Muellner, Leonard. 1996. *The Anger of Achilles: Menis in Greek Epic*. Ithaca, N. Y.

Murnaghan, Sheila. 1997. “Equal Honor and Future Glory: the Plan of Zeus in the *Iliad*.” In *Classical closure: reading the end in Greek and Latin literature*. Ed. Deborah H. Roberts et al. Princeton. 23-42.

Nagler, Michael. 1974. *Spontaneity and Tradition: A Study in the Oral Art of Homer*. Berkeley.

———. 1990. “Odysseus: The Proem and the Problem.” *Classical Antiquity* 9:335-56.

Nagy, Gregory. 1979. *The Best of the Achaeans*. Baltimore.

———. 1983. “*Sêma* and *Noêsis*: Some Illustrations.” *Arethusa* 16: 35-55.

———. 1990. *Greek Mythology and Poetics*. Ithaca, N. Y.

Nelson, T. G. A. 1990. *Comedy: an Introduction to Comedy in Literature, Drama, and Cinema*. Oxford.

Niles, John D. 1979. “Ring Composition and the Structure of Beowulf.” *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 94:924-35.

Nimis, Stephen. 1987. *Narrative Semiotics in the Epic Tradition: The Simile*. Bloomington, Ind.

Oden, Jr., Robert A. 1981. “Divine Aspirations in *Atrahasis* and in Genesis 1-11.” *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 93:197-216.

de Polignac, François. 1995. *Cults, Territory, and the Origins of the Greek City-State*. Trans. J. Lloyd. Chicago.

Porzig, W. 1930. *Illuyankas und Typhon.* Kleinasiatische Forschungen 1. 379-386.

Pucci, Pietro. 1987. *Odysseus Polutropos: Intertextual Readings in the Odyssey and the Iliad*. Ithaca, N. Y.

Purves, Alex. 2006. “Falling into Time in Homer’s *Iliad*.” *Classical Antiquity* 25:179–209.

Raaflaub, Kurt A.. 1993. “Homer to Solon. The Rise of the Polis. The Written Sources.” In *The Ancient Greek City-State: Symposium on the occasion of the 250th Anniversary of the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters. July 1-4 1992*. Ed. M. H. Hansen. Copenhagen. 41-105.

———. 1997. “Homeric Society.” In *A New Companion to Homer.* Ed. I Morris and B. Powell. Leiden. 624-48.

Ratzel, Friedrich. 1895-96. “Die deutsche Landschaft.” *Halbmonatshefte der deutschen Rundschau* 4:407-28.

Redfield, James M. 1994. *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: the Tragedy of Hector*. Chapel Hill, N. C.

Reinhardt, Karl. 1960. “Das Parisurteil.” In *Tradition und Geist. Gesammelte Essays zur Dichtung*. Ed. C. Becker. Göttingen. 13-36.

Richards, Ivor A. 1936. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. Oxford.

Richardson, Nicholas J. 1993. *The Iliad: a Commentary*. *Volume 6*: *Books 21-24*. Cambridge.

Robertson, Noel. 1984. “The Ritual Background of the Erysichthon Story.” *American Journal of Philology* 105:369-408.

Rose, Gilbert P. 1969. “The Unfriendly Phaeacians.” *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 100:387-406.

de Ste. Croix, G. E. M. 1981. *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World.* Ithaca.

Sauer, Carl O. 1925. “The Morphology of Landscape”. *University of California Publications in Geography* 2:19-53.

Schein, Seth L. 1984. *The Mortal Hero: An Introduction to Homer’s Iliad*. Berkeley.

Scodel, Ruth. 1982. “The Achaean Wall and the Myth of Destruction.” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 86:33-52.

———. 2002. *Listening to Homer: Tradition, Narrative, and Audience*. Ann Arbor, Mich.

Scully, Stephen. 1998. “The Nature of the Gods in Early Greek Poetic Thought.” In *Philosophies of Nature: The Human Dimension. In celebration of Erazim Kohák*. Ed. R. Cohen and A. Tauber. Dordrecht. 163-76.

———. 1990. *Homer and the Sacred City*. Ithaca.

Sihler, David. 1995. *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. Oxford.

Sinos, Dale. 1980. *Achilles, Patroklos, and the Meaning of Philos*. Innsbruck.

Slatkin, Laura M. 1991. *The Power of Thetis*. Berkeley.

Smith, Mark S. 1994. *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle*. Leiden.

Snell, B. and M. Meier-Brügger, eds. 1995–. *Lexicon des frühgriechischen epos*. Göttingen.

Solmsen, Friedrich. 1949. *Hesiod and Aeschylus*. Ithaca, N.Y.

Strasburger, Gisela. 1954. *Die kleine Kämpfer in der Ilias*. Frankfurt.

Szemerényi, Oswald. 1974. “The Origins of the Greek Lexicon: Ex Oriente Lux.” *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 94:144-157.

Taplin, Oliver. 1992. *Homeric Soundings: The Shaping of the Iliad*. Oxford.

Thomas, H. and Stubbings, Frank H. 1962. “Lands and Peoples in Homer.” In *A Companion to Homer*. Ed. A. Wace and F. Stubbings. London. 283-310.

Thornton, Agathe. 1984. *Homer’s Iliad: Its Composition and the Motif of Supplication*. Göttingen.

Tigay, Jeffrey H. 1982. *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic*. Philadelphia.

Vacca, Robert. 1991. “The Theology of Disorder in the *Iliad*.” *Religion & Literature* 23:1-22.

Van der Valk, M. 1963-64. *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad*. 2 vols. Leiden.

Vian, Francis. 1960. “Le mythe de Typhée et le problème de ses origines orientales.” In *Éléments Orientaux dans la Religion Grecque Ancienne*. *Colloque de Strasbourg, 22-24 Mai 1958*. Ed. O. Eissfeldt. Paris. 17-37.

Walcot, Peter. 1966. *Hesiod and the Near East*. Cardiff.

Walsh, Thomas R. 2005. *Fighting Words and Feuding Words: Anger and the Homeric Poems*. Lanham, MD.

Watkins, Calvert. 1995. *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. Oxford.

West, Martin L., ed. 1966. *Hesiod. Theogony*. Oxford.

———. 1997. *The East Face of Helicon*. Oxford.

Whitman, Charles H. 1958. *Homer and the Homeric Tradition*. Cambridge, Mass.

Willcock, Malcolm M. 1964. "Mythological Paradeigma in the Iliad." *Classical Quarterly*. 14:141-54.

———.1995. "The Importance of *Iliad* 8." In *Homer's World: Fiction, Tradition, Reality*. Ed. Ø. Andersen and M. Dickie. Papers From the Norwegian Institute at Athens 3. Jonesred. 113-21.

Wilson, Donna F. 2002. *Ransom, Revenge, and Heroic Identity in the Iliad*. Cambridge.

Wood, Robert. 1775. *An Essay on the Original Genius and Writings of Homer. With a Comparative View of the Ancient and Present State of the Troade*. London.

Wyatt, Nicolas. 1998. "Arms and the King. The Earliest Allusions to the *Chaoskampf* Motif and Their Implication for the Interpretation of the Ugaritic and Biblical Traditions."

———. 2003. "'Water, Water Everywhere…': Musings on the Aqueous Myths of the Near East." In *De la Tablilla a la Inteligencia Artificial*. *Homenaje al Prof. Jesús-Luis Cunchillos en su 65 aniversario*. Zaragoza. 211-59.

Vita

Christopher Patrick Lovell was born in San Francisco, California, and at a young age moved to Overland Park, Kansas, where he attended Shawnee Mission North High School. He attended Reed College in Portland, Oregon, receiving a Bachelor of Arts degree in Classics and Religion in 1996. In September 1998 he began graduate study in Classics at the University of Texas at Austin, receiving a Master of Arts degree in 2000. He has taught Classics at the University of Minnesota, Vassar College, Bennington College, and Williams College.

Permanent address: 19 Chapin Court, Williamstown, Massachusetts 01267
This dissertation was typed by the author.